1.4.02

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division BS2650

Section 4.K73

Shelf

Number

THE

WITNESS OF THE EPISTLES

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

THE

WITNESS OF THE EPISTLES

A STUDY IN MODERN CRITICISM

BY THE REV.

R. J. KNOWLING, M.A.

VICE-PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

AND NEW YORK : 15 EAST 16th STREET

1892

All rights reserved

PREFACE

SOME years ago a remarkable series of articles by Dr. Matheson appeared in the 'Expositor,' entitled 'The Historical Christ of St. Paul.' These articles drew out with great force and skill the argument from the four Epistles of St. Paul, Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, as an historical basis for the facts of the life of Jesus. But although this argument was not entirely new to English Apologists, and although it has since been frequently employed and popularised, it may be of some fresh interest and value to consider the subject more generally, taking into particular account the manner in which it has been treated by various foreign theologians.

Careful attention has also been given, both in the text and in the notes, to Sabatier's 'L'Apôtre Paul,' and to the treatises of Paret, Thenius, and Huraut, all of whom are specially mentioned by Reuss in the last edition of his 'Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.' as literary authorities for Paul's acquaintance with the historical life and teaching of our Lord (see Chapter II. pp. 84–86), and references will frequently be found to modern Apologetic literature in England.

The value of Paret's work will be best seen by the list of modern critics who refer to or quote him (Chap. p. II. 86), and his statements have often been introduced at length, but never without some acknowledgment.

The whole of Chapter III. is devoted to recent attacks

upon the same four Epistles of St. Paul—the *Hauptbriefe*, as the Germans call them—for two reasons. First, because it is not fair to assert that there is a school of theologians in Germany by which these Epistles are rejected, without a due consideration of the critical authority which accepts them; and secondly, because while many English writers (*e.g.* Mr. Gore in his 'Bampton Lectures') have justly spoken of the 'utterly untenable and perverse arguments' of Loman and Steck, yet it seemed more satisfactory to examine objections at length, even at the cost of some apparent interruption in the argument, and so to clear the way for the chapters which follow. In Chapter II. and Chapter V. I am greatly indebted to the recent articles of Dr. Sanday in the 'Expositor' for introducing me to the writings of P. Ewald, Resch, and Bousset; and in the endeavour to traverse a very wide field of inquiry I am deeply sensible that I must ask much of the indulgence of my readers.

R. J. KNOWLING.

King's College, London:
Easter 1892.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING AND IMPORTANCE OF THE WITNESS

St. Paul a contemporary witness to the facts of the life of Jesus, pp. 1, 2—the early date of his conversion, attested by Keim, Hausrath, Volkmar, and the recent remarks of Renan, 3—whilst his four great Epistles insure him the title of a contemporary witness, the testimony which adds to them 1 Thess., the earliest of the Pauline writings, 4—importance of the admission of Rom. xv. and xvi. by Hilgenfeld and others, as showing that St. Paul was in close communication with those whose sources of information were earlier than his own, 4-6—modern criticism justifies us in adding 1 Thess., Philippians, Philemon, and, in part, Colossians, to the four great Epistles, 6—the views of H. Ewald, Reuss, Schenkel, Sabatier, H. Holtzmann, Renan, Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, and others, 6–11—importance of the admission of 1 Thess. and Philippians, 11—negative criticism in England admits these two documents in addition to the four great Epistles, 11—contrast in this respect between Baur and modern German scholarship, 11—the testimony of B. Weiss, 12—these Epistles presuppose the story of the Gospels, 12—their position in the foreground of Christian Evidences, 13—further justification of this position, 14, 15—the historical argument from the Pauline Epistles valid against the 'mythical' and 'legendary' theories, 16—the rightful use and meaning of these terms, 16, 17—references to Hettinger, Weiss, Nösgen, and others, 17, 18—Baur's influence upon Strauss in relation to the mythical theory, 18—the valuable criticism of C. Ullmann upon the position of Strauss, and his testimony to the importance of the witness of St. Paul's Epistles, 19-21—the un-Jewish elements in the Gospels, and in the Epistles, a further objection to the mythical theory, 22, 23

CHAPTER II

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT

References to English writers upon St. Paul's Epistles as an historical basis for the life and teaching of Jesus, pp. 24, 25—important to show how continental theologians have treated the same subject, 25—Karl Hase, 25-27—Baur, 27-29—Schwegler, 29-34—Ritschl, 33—H. Ewald, 34-36—Neander, 36-38—Holsten, 38-40—Hilgenfeld, 40-43—Schenkel, 43, 44—Keim, 44-51—Hausrath, 51-54—Wittichen, 54-62—Weizsäcker, 62, 63—Pfleiderer, 64-66—Holtzmann, 66-71—Reuss, 71—Renan, 71-73—De Pressensé, 73-77—

B. Weiss, 77–84—Paret, 84—Sabatier, 86—Huraut, 86—Thenius, 87—he anticipates the position of Pfleiderer and of Volkmar, 87–92—how Pfleiderer's position may be utilised in the argument, 93—Beyschlag, 93–100—Wendt, 100–105—Resch, 105, 106—P. Ewald's criticism of his *Agrapha*, 106–114—Resch's *Agrapha* further examined, 114–129—Bousset's criticism of Resch, 129–131—the strictures of Nösgen, 131—value of Resch's work for the present argument, 132—Harnack, in relation to the subject of this chapter, 131 *note*—conclusion from the foregoing, 132

CHAPTER III

RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE 'HAUPTBRIEFE'

Steck and Völter really reproduce many of the arguments of Bruno Bauer, p. 133—important criticism of Zahn upon these attacks, 134–139—Bruno Bauer, 139—Pierson and Naber, 140–144—Loman, 144–149—criticism of Kuenen and Scholten upon Loman's theory, 149–154—Loman's reply, and how received, 155—Steck's attack upon the *Hauptbriefe*, 155, 156—the historical difficulties raised by him, and the replies of Gloël, Lindemann, B. Weiss, 156–164—Steck's theory of the order of the *Hauptbriefe*, and the strictures of Gloël and Lindemann, 164–175—further criticism of Steck's attack upon the historical character and language of the Galatian Epistle, 175–179—examination of the external evidence in favour of the historical position assumed in the Galatian Epistle, 179–188—points of likeness between Steck and Völter. 189—examination of Steck's theory that the *Hauptbriefe* are dependent upon our Gospels, 189–196—Steck's method of dealing with the account of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor., 196–200—and with the Resurrection appearances in 1 Cor. xv., 200–208—Steck's account of St. Paul's lofty Christology, 208–211—his attempted proof of the dependence of the *Hauptbriefe* upon extra-canonical writings, 211–213—upon Philo and Seneca, 213–215—Gloël's important criticism, 215—the more recent attack of Völter, 216—his reconstruction of the Epistle to the Romans, and his rejection of all but the 'original' letter, 217–224—the same method applied to the Epistle to the Galatians, 225—Völter's argument that Galatians is really dependent upon the other *Hauptbriefe*, 225, 226—his attack upon the historical notices in the Galatians, and his preference, similar to that of Steck, for the Acts, 225–230—contrast in this respect between Steck and Völter and the position occupied by Baur, 230—further examination of Völter's alleged discrepancies between Galatians and the Acts, and the arbitrary and subjective nature of his criticism, 230–237—his attack upon the historical position assumed in the Galatians met by Gloël's reply (warmly endorsed by Hilgenfeld) to the similar attack of Steck, 237, 238—protest of Lipsius, Hilgenfeld, Holsten, and others, against these attacks of Steck and his followers upon the *Hauptbriefe*, 239, 240—Godet's admirable criticism of Steck's theory, and his proof that the three ideas which dominate Paul's teaching in the Romans are essentially Jewish, and therefore not derived, as Steck maintains, from a Græco-Roman school of the second century, 240–242—further counter-criticism of Steck's theory by recent writers, 242—Weizsäcker's description of 1 and 2 Cor. may fairly be extended to the four *Hauptbriefe*, 243

CHAPTER IV

ST. PAUL'S CHRISTOLOGY AND THE INCARNATION

Cannot be dismissed as mere 'secondary questions' with Baur, p. 244—'the Pauline Gospel of the Infancy,' Gal. iv. 4, 244 ff.—'made under the law': what this implies, 245, 246, and notes—testimony of Steinmeyer, Schenkel, Wittichen, Nösgen, &c., 245, 246—force of the expression 'God sent forth His Son,' and how interpreted by Lightfoot, Weiss, Lechler, Hilgenfeld, Steck, Pfleiderer, Martineau, 245–249—question whether Paul's conception of Christ as the sinless Head of humanity does not demand a miraculous conception: testimony of Neander, Lechler, Huraut, Weiss, Schmid, 250 and notes—references in the Pauline Epistles at least in harmony with those of the Gospels: no right to expect more from epistolary writings, 251—in this connection, importance of Paul's reference to the descent of Christ from David, 252, 253 (and also 293)—Gal. iv. 4 does not stand alone: comp. Rom. viii. 3 and 32, 253, 254—force of these passages, and reference to Baur, Lechler, Sabatier, Schmid, Reuss, P. Ewald, Roos, 254, 255—significance of the fact that these expressions are found in one of Paul's generally accepted Epistles, 256—St. Paul's 'advanced' Christology in Ephes. and Col. justified, 256–259—references in this connection to Schenkel, Reuss, Hase, Renan, *ibid.*—parallel between Col. i. 16 and 1 Cor. viii. 6, 260—the latter passage not to be restricted to the redemptive work of Christ, or to a moral creation, 260—Phil. ii. 6: criticism of Reuss, Sabatier, Lipsius, against Baur's interpretation: the real force of the passage, 260, 261—significance of the word Κύριος as applied to Jesus, 261—testimony of Ritschl, 262—Schmid, 263—Gess, 264—Lechler, 264—Gloël, 264—Weiss, 265—Sabatier, Schanz, Pfleiderer, Carpenter, 266—early use of the word in 1 Thess. against Martineau's theory of the later growth of such expressions, 267, 268—examination of 1 Cor. xv. 47, 268—criticism of the views held by Sabatier and Beyschlag, 269, 270—Christ's pre-existence not merely ideal or impersonal, 270—interpretation in this connection of 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 5, 6, 270, 271—contrast between 1 Cor. xv. 45–47 and Jewish systems, 272, 273—refusal to admit that Paul taught the doctrine of the Incarnation substitutes one difficulty for another, 274—thus, Keim denies Paul's knowledge of a divine nativity, but finds nothing more suitable to express his own conceptions of the Personality of Jesus than the language of Paul's earliest Epistles, 274, 275—further admits that the creative act of God in the Person of Jesus was unique, 275—Godet's criticism on Keim's position, 275 (see also p. 250)—Keim's endeavour to avoid the difficulty, 276—doctrine of the Incarnation could not have arisen on Jewish soil, 277, 278—testimony of Neander, Steinmeyer, Weiss, Edersheim, Didon, Nösgen, *ibid.*—nor from Gentile sources, 278—valuable criticism of Steinhart as to the origin of the story of Plato's miraculous birth, 278—no implicit confidence to be placed in the statements of Diogenes Laertius, 279, 280—early Christian Apologists and their view of pagan myths, 281—how St. Paul's language reminds us that we are again on the lines of the Gospels, 281, 282—his expression 'the second Adam' in harmony with that of 'the Son of Man,' 282 ff.—references to Paret, Gess, Dorner, Sabatier, on this point, 282, 283—'the second Adam' identified by Paul with the historical Christ, 284—his conception not

derived from Philo or Plato, *ibid.*—valuable testimony of Ritschl, 285—the title 'Son of Man' both human and divine, 285—Neander, Keim, Schanz, on this title, 285, 286—why it is not found in the Epistles, 287—remarks of Gess and Keim, and of English writers, upon this omission, 287—further objection to the assertion that the 'legend' of the Incarnation was post-Apostolic, and, above all, post-Pauline, 287—Keim again fails to take sufficient account of the facts of the case, 287—contrast between the Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels, 288—similarity of the views of W. H. Mill and Weiss as to the silence of Epistles with regard to the Incarnation, 289 note—Beyschlag on the Incarnation, 289, 290

CHAPTER V

OUR LORD'S LIFE AND TEACHING

The expression 'mode of life' as used in this connection, p. 291—statements in the Epistles in agreement with the facts and spirit of the Gospel narratives, 291—the poverty of Jesus, 291, 292—the human surroundings of Jesus, 293—His life of meekness and gentleness, 294—His life of service, 294—the historical pattern of Love, 295—the sufferings of Jesus, *ibid.*—His life our example, 296, 297—tempted as we are, 297—His sinlessness, 298—objections raised to it, 299–301—the miraculous power of Jesus, how connected with Paul's conception of an Apostle, and with his Epistles, 301 ff.—Paret's remarks, and those of Schmid, in this connection, 304, 305—the character of the Apostle in its bearing upon this subject, 306—importance of the representation of Jesus as the Christ, 307—how much this common feature of the Apostles' preaching involved, 308, 309—proclamation of the Kingdom in the Epistles and Gospels alike, 309—its laws and characteristics, 310–314—positive evidence of Paul's knowledge of Christ's sayings and commands, 315—the Lord's Supper, 315, 316—Paul's frequent references to Baptism, 316, 317—his words of consolation to the Thessalonians, 318—significance of the Apostle's teaching on such subjects, 318—Paul's *practical* exhortation to the Corinthians in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, 319, 320—plain distinction between his own opinion and the command of Christ, 319, 320—1 Cor. ix. 14 and Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 7, 320–323—Paul's use of our Lord's imagery, 323—Holtzmann on 'the sayings of the Lord,' 323, 324—some further instances, 324, 325—connection between St. Luke and St. Paul, 325—Holtzmann's parallels between Luke's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, 326—criticism of Holtzmann's view of the dependence of the former upon the latter, 326–328—Luke's 'universalism' and 'Paulinism,' how related to the teaching of Jesus, 328—connection between St. John and St. Paul, 329—maintained by Dr. Matheson, 329—references to other writers on the same side, 330—P. Ewald's maintenance of a Johannine tradition, 331, 332—examination in detail of his parallels between the fourth Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, 333–347—conclusions, 347, 348

CHAPTER VI

OUR LORD'S DEATH AND BURIAL

Importance attached in Epistles and Gospels alike to the last hours of Jesus, pp. 349, 350—details in the Epistles, in accordance with those of the Gospels,

350, 351, and notes—institution of the Lord's Supper, 351–353 - importance of the word διαθήκη, 353—the words of institution, 353—the significance of the words in relation to the death of Jesus, 354—acknowledged by Keim, by Strauss, and by Harnack, 353, 354—references to other writers, 355—our Lord's claim to supersede the old Mosaic covenant, 355—importance of this claim in the eyes of Jews, 355—and therefore of Paul, *ibid.*—Wendt on the significance of the Lord's Supper, 356—reference of the words and acts of Jesus to Exodus, xxiv. 8, 356—possible references to the scenes of the Passion, 358–360—Paul's representation of the death of Jesus in entire harmony with that of the Evangelists, 359—the Christian Church founded by a Crucified Jew: what this presupposes, 359–362—the Crucifixion issued in death, 362—the reality of the death of Jesus, 362, 363—Paul at one with the Gospels in his testimony to the burial of Jesus, 363—the fact of the burial emphasised by Weiss, Beyschlag, Nösgen, Keim, &c., 363, 364

CHAPTER VII

THE RESURRECTION

The Creeds and 1 Cor. xv. 4, p. 365—'according to the Scriptures,' *ibid.*—the Resurrection, as it took place, foreign to Jewish ideas, 366, 367—'the third day,' 367, 368—the appearances enumerated by St. Paul, 369—a summary of facts already communicated, 369—the appearances to Peter and James, 370–372—the appearances to the Twelve, to all the Apostles, to the five hundred, 372, 373—Holtzmann on Luke and Paul in this connection, 374—Paul's principle of selection, 375, 376—how the account in 1 Cor. xv. confirms the Gospels, 377—the appearance to Paul himself, *ibid.*—Paret's examination of Paul's own statements, 378 ff.—criticism of Beyschlag as against Baur, *ibid.* notes—on the force of ἔκτρωμα, 381—Paul's 'reserve,' *ibid.*—on 2 Cor. xii. 9, 383—Paul able to distinguish between visions and realities, *ibid.*—1 Cor. ix. and 1 Cor. xv. to be distinguished from 2 Cor. xii. 9, 384 ff.—on the importance of the expression 'last of all,' 385, 386—the death, the burial, the resurrection of Jesus, how viewed by St. Paul, 386, 387—not merely a spiritual but a bodily resurrection, 388—results in past ages of the Church of the separation between the historical and the ideal, 388, 389—Paul's mental state at the time of his conversion, 389, 390—attempts to analyse it, 390–392—called upon to account not only for his *conversion*, but also for his *apostleship*, 392—Keim on the vision-theory, 392, 393—Hase on the same, 394—Gospel narratives of the Resurrection not to be summarily dismissed, 394—the Tübingen school unable to explain either the resurrection of Jesus or Paul's conversion, 395—but these two facts, the turning-points, as Lichtenberger calls them, of the Apostolic Age, 396

CHAPTER VIII

THE ASCENSION AND THE RETURN

The Ascension the complement of the Resurrection, p. 397—Keim on the unanimous assertion of the New Testament writers, *ibid.*—the Pauline Epistles and the Ascension, 398—no detailed account of the event given by Paul, and

why, 398-400—the Ascension not derived from Old Testament sources or existing Messianic conceptions, 400, 401—nor from pagan sources, 401—Paul's references to Christ as the future Judge, 402, 403—significance of the attribution of this office to Jesus, 403—most frequent references to the coming of Christ in 1 and 2 Thess., 404—reason for this, *ibid.*—connection between the Epistles and the discourse of Jesus on the Mount of Olives, 404-407—difficulties presented by 1 Thess. iv. 15-18, 407—Paret's view of the passage, 407-410—probable reason for its introduction, practical, 410, 411—connection with sayings of Jesus in the Gospels, 411, 412—caution in dealing with Paul's language and conceptions as to the Saviour's return, 412, 413—no parallel between the return of a hero, or some hero king, and Christ's coming again from heaven, 413, 414

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AS AN 'EVANGELIST'

Important questions raised by the previous chapters, p. 415—unlikelihood that Paul should have absolutely ignored the facts of the Saviour's life, 415—examination in this connection of the statement that Jesus was the Christ, 415, 416—cannot infer a scanty knowledge of the sayings of Jesus from Paul's frequent use of the Old Testament, 416, 417—Paul's position *before* his conversion unintelligible without some information as to the teaching of Jesus, 418—his position *after* his conversion equally so, 419, 420—further reason why he should refrain from multiplying quotations even from the teaching of Jesus, 420—Paul able to refer practically and decisively to the words and acts of Jesus, 421—sources of the Apostle's knowledge twofold, tradition, oral or written, and revelation, 421—cannot assign positively the part due to each, 422—his strength lies in the union of the two, 423—Paul's position, in this respect, and that of the first disciples, 423, 424—difficulty of distinguishing between these two sources (tradition, revelation) discussed in connection with 1 Cor. xi. 23, 424-426—Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ no mere recital of 'dead facts,' 427—must take into account the spiritual element in his character, *ibid.*—this necessity recognised by Weizsäcker, *ibid.*—significance of the expression 'to reveal His Son *in me*,' 428—the first instance of the *mystical* use of the preposition ἐν, as in St. John's language, 428—this union between Paul and his Lord only to be expressed by our word *religion*, 429—and yet the Apostle's faith rested in the historical Christ, *ibid.*—but no mere intellectual acceptance of His Messiahship, 430—cannot account for Paul's change of life and character by his reflecting upon Old Testament prophecy, or by his Jewish theology, 431—equally unable to account for them by Hellenistic influences, 432—face to face with a life-giving Personality, which neither Hellenism nor Judaism can explain, and with a new relationship between God and man, realised in a mystical union with Jesus by faith, 433—Christianity contained a new principle, the preaching and the power of the Cross, 434—choice of Saul the Pharisee to illustrate this power, 434—how his whole Christian life depended, in a very true sense, on the death and resurrection of Christ, 434-436.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES QUOTED 437

Errata

Page 19, note[1], line 3, *for* Rusultate *read* Resultate
,, 132, note[1], line 10, *read* vol. i. p. 113
,, 164, line 10, *read* contact *for* contrast
,, 274, note[7], line 1, *for* thirty years *read* twenty years
,, 355, last line, *read a comma after the first* him
,, 405, note[1], line 23, *for* נחבל *read* כחבל

why, 398–400—the Ascension not derived from Old Testament sources or existing Messianic conceptions, 400, 401—nor from pagan sources, 401—Paul's references to Christ as the future Judge, 402, 403—significance of the attribution of this office to Jesus, 403—most frequent references to the coming of Christ in 1 and 2 Thess., 404—reason for this, *ibid.*—connection between the Epistles and the discourse of Jesus on the Mount of Olives, 404–407—difficulties presented by 1 Thess. iv. 15–18, 407—Paret's view of the passage, 407–410—probable reason for its introduction, practical, 410, 411—connection with sayings of Jesus in the Gospels, 411, 412—caution in dealing with Paul's language and conceptions as to the Saviour's return, 412, 413—no parallel between the return of a hero, or some hero king, and Christ's coming again from heaven, 413, 414

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AS AN 'EVANGELIST'

connection with 1 Cor. xi. 23, 424–426—Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ no mere recital of 'dead facts,' 427—must take into account the spiritual element in his character, *ibid.*—this necessity recognised by Weizsäcker, *ibid.*—significance of the expression 'to reveal His Son *in me*,' 428—the first instance of the *mystical* use of the preposition ἐν, as in St. John's language, 428—this union between Paul and his Lord only to be expressed by our word *religion*, 429—and yet the Apostle's faith rested in the historical Christ, *ibid.*—but no mere intellectual acceptance of His Messiahship, 430—cannot account for Paul's change of life and character by his reflecting upon Old Testament prophecy, or by his Jewish theology, 431—equally unable to account for them by Hellenistic influences, 432—face to face with a life-giving Personality, which neither Hellenism nor Judaism can explain, and with a new relationship between God and man, realised in a mystical union with Jesus by faith, 433—Christianity contained a new principle, the preaching and the power of the Cross, 434—choice of Saul the Pharisee to illustrate this power, 434—how his whole Christian life depended, in a very true sense, on the death and resurrection of Christ, 434–436.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES QUOTED 437

THE

WITNESS OF THE EPISTLES

CHAPTER I

THE MEANING AND IMPORTANCE OF THIS WITNESS

THE readers of Mr. Darwin's 'Life and Letters' will recall his pathetic description of his loss of faith, and rejection of the Christian Creed; how he tells us of his unwillingness to give up his belief; how he felt quite sure of this, for he could remember often and often inventing day-dreams of old letters between distinguished Romans, and MSS. discovered at Pompeii or elsewhere, which should confirm, in the most striking manner, all that was written in our Gospels.[1] But, as a matter of fact, we are in possession of letters—old letters—which go far, very far, to confirm the statements recorded in the Gospels, and which constitute historical evidence of the highest value, for no evidence is more valuable than the letters of a writer contemporary with the events which he professes to describe; and a further exercise of the patience for which Mr. Darwin's name has become so justly proverbial might perhaps have shown him that this is no unreasonable assertion.

Even if the term *contemporary* be not admitted with regard to the testimony of the four Evangelists, and if it must remain an open question whether St. Paul ever saw our Lord in the flesh, and listened to His teaching,[2] yet no one can

[1] Vol. i. p. 108.

[2] See Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 35, 36, and note, on different authorities for and against; and for the views of some more recent writers, see below, chap. ii.

fairly refuse the word to the Apostle's testimony to the facts of the life of Jesus. For, in the first place, it is not unimportant to observe that the date of St. Paul's conversion is

Comp. also Paret, 'Paulus und Jesus,' in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1858, p. 64, note. Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, i. 127, 5. Aufl. 1862 (neuer Abdruck, 1890); Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 52; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains* (Introd.), i. 13, 2nd edit.; Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 122; Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 115, 2. Aufl. 1889; Holtzmann in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 16, 1889, and Schmiedel, *ibid.* ii.; erste Abtheilung, p. 206, 1891. Beyschlag (*Studien und Kritiken*, p. 248, note, 1864, and *ibid.* p. 22, 1870) argues that the expression in 2 Cor. v. 16, of which so much has been made in this connection, cannot refer, as Baur and Holsten maintained, to a contrast between Paul's earlier and existing idea of the Messiah. The words ἐγνωκέναι κατὰ σάρκα, in Beyschlag's view, can only refer to an external knowledge of Jesus, a knowledge face to face, a knowledge, *i.e.*, without any inward believing relation to Him. Thus the Judaisers in Corinth 'who gloried in appearance and not in heart,' ἐν προσώπῳ καυχώμενοι καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ (2 Cor. v. 12), boasted that they not only knew the disciples and brethren of Christ, but that they had known even Christ Himself during His earthly life, while they were unbelievers, much better than Paul. The Apostle makes answer that so, too, in like manner, had he known Him, whilst he had been a scholar in the school of the Pharisees in Jerusalem, but that since he had been *in Christ* (ἐν Χριστῷ) he knew Him in that former manner no more; that in virtue of Christ's death, in which all, according to their outward natural man, were fully comprehended, there could be no question of any external knowledge of this man or of that (of the older Apostles, of the brethren of Christ, and others), *i.e.* of any outward connection in the kingdom of God. In support of his view that the words cannot refer to any contrast between the carnal idea of a Jewish national Messiah and the Christ whom Paul knew after his conversion, Beyschlag points out that the words ἐγνώκεναι κατὰ σάρκα are connected together, and not Χριστὸν κατὰ σάρκα, as Baur and Holsten's view would demand.

Paret, Neander, and Weiss are of opinion that 2 Cor. v. 16 is not sufficient to *prove* Paul's acquaintance with Jesus during His earthly life, and that we have no sufficient *data* to go upon. It is of interest to notice that Paret (*ubi supra*) refers in his note to Professor Jowett's view put forward in the *Introd.* to the Epistles to the Thessalonians, although he admits that it has been met by weighty objections, viz. that 2 Cor. v. 16 may be explained as referring to an earlier period of the Apostle's preaching, a period marked by the Epistles to the Thessalonians (comp. Gal. v. 2), in which the Apostle had not freed himself as at a later period from Jewish conceptions of the Person and work of Jesus.

In Godet's view the passage in question does not involve Paul's acquaintance with the earthly Jesus, and he thinks that the words refer to the pretensions of those who boasted of their personal relations with the Lord, or equally well to the carnal character of the prevailing Messianic hope amongst the Jews, and as in no other expression can it be maintained that Paul alludes to seeing Jesus during His earthly life, he concludes with Renan and Mangold that the Apostle must have been absent from Jerusalem (see, however, Keim, *ubi supra*).

Sabatier, although he does not by any means exclude Paul's knowledge of the earthly Jesus, regards 2 Cor. v. 16 as containing a reference to the Jewish national

fixed by hostile and negative critics both in France and Germany considerably earlier than it has often been by Christian apologists. We have, for example, in M. Renan's recent 'Histoire du Peuple d'Israël,' two important statements, one in the Introduction: 'Jesus is known to us by at least one contemporary piece of evidence, that of St. Paul;'[1] and the other in a comparison drawn between Moses and Christ: 'Moses is completely buried by the legends which have grown up over him; and though he very probably existed, it is impossible to speak of him as we do of other deified or transformed men. Moses, from the historic point of view, cannot be at all compared with Jesus. St. Paul admits Jesus to have been a person who in reality existed. Now St. Paul was a contemporary of Jesus; he was converted to the sect four or five years after the death of Jesus (see Epistle to the Galatians).'[2]

If we turn to Germany, Hausrath, according to his chronology, places Paul's conversion in the year following the Crucifixion; Keim within two years (possibly within one) of the same event, and Volkmar at a similar distance.[3]

It becomes more needful to lay stress upon the statements of such critics on this point, in face of the last attempt of the author of 'Supernatural Religion' to disparage Paul's personal testimony to the Resurrection by basing it upon a vision 'seen many years' after the alleged miracle.[4] But if St. Paul's conversion could be assigned to the latest possible date, his

Messiah, triumphing in a carnal sense, whom Paul had known before his conversion (comp. Schmiedel, *ubi supra*), but who now, after the rising from the dead, had become a new Christ, a Christ κατὰ πνεῦμα (comp. Weizsäcker, *ubi supra*, who finds a further explanation of 2 Cor. v. 16 in Rom. i. 4).

[1] *Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*, i. Introd. p. xviii, 2nd edit. 1887.

[2] 'La légende a entièrement recouvert Moïse, et, quoique son existence soit très probable, il est impossible de parler de lui comme on parle des autres hommes divinisés ou transformés. Moïse, au point de vue de l'historicité, ne peut nullement être rapproché de Jésus. Saint Paul admet sûrement Jésus comme un personnage ayant existé. Or Saint Paul est contemporain de Jésus; il s'est converti à la secte quatre ou cinq ans après la mort de Jésus (*Epître aux Galates*).' *Ibid.* p. 159, and note 4.

[3] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 35; Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. p. 51; Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, p. 394; comp. Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 12; Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 9. See, however, Schürer's criticism of Keim's chronology, *Geschichte j. V. im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, i. 368.

[4] See new work by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, 1889, p. 165.

four great Epistles—Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians —would fairly ensure him the title of a contemporary witness,[1] especially if we consider the weight of the testimony which adds to these four 1 Thessalonians, the earliest of all the Pauline Epistles.[2]

It is evident that if we argue from the chronology adopted by Keim and the negative critics above mentioned, we are brought by this First Epistle to the Thessalonians within twenty years of the Crucifixion, within a less time than that which separates us from the Franco-German war of 1870; and we certainly should not be justified in refusing the name of contemporary history to a document, dating from the present year, which purported to give an historical account of the last great European struggle.[3]

Of course, quite irrespectively of the exact date of his conversion, Paul's testimony can be carried much further back than the date of his first extant Epistle, and no one has insisted upon this more emphatically than Keim.[1]

But it is of interest to remember that such an incidental piece of information as that which meets us in the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, 'Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the Apostles, who also were in Christ before me,' and upon which Christian apologists have rightly insisted as

[1] The recent attacks upon these four Epistles are discussed in chap. iii.

[2] See pp. 8–11. In addition to the testimonies quoted in these pages, we may add that of Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. p. 7, erste Abtheilung, 1890; Hase, *Kirchengeschichte* (Vorlesungen), erster Theil, p. 140, 1885; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 14, note; and Mangold's acceptance of this Epistle, with the strong list of those who have defended it against Baur, which he gives in his edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 501, 502, 1886. In this list he mentions those who have accepted 1 Thess. whilst rejecting 2 Thess. —Lipsius (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 905 ff.); Hilgenfeld (see below); Hausrath (*Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, ii. p. 600); Pfleiderer (*Der Paulinismus*, 1873, p. 28); Holtzmann (*Bibl. Lex.* v., 1875, p. 501 ff.). To these he adds the name of H. von Soden (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1885, p. 263 ff.). For Renan's acceptance of 1 and 2 Thess. see below, p. 10; and for Hase's testimony, see chap. ii. p. 27. The remarks of Gloël in his *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, 1890, pp. 40, 41, in their bearing upon the authenticity of 1 and 2 Thess., may also be consulted with advantage.

[3] Comp. Sadler's remarks in *The Lost Gospel*, p. 196.

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 531–533.

showing that St. Paul was in close communication with those whose sources of information were earlier than his own, and that his allusions to the great facts of the Christian Creed were perfectly intelligible to them, is now placed upon a securer basis than in the first days of the Tübingen school.

Thus, whilst we are often justly reminded that Baur accepted as authentic the four Pauline Epistles, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, we ought not to lose sight of the fact that he rejected the last two chapters of the Epistle to the Romans ('Paulus,' i. 393–409). The chief motive which prompted him to do so—the motive which underlies all his other objections—is plainly revealed in the concluding words of the first volume of his 'Paulus' (i. 409), in which he assigns these chapters to some member of the Pauline school, who desired, in the spirit of the author of the Acts, to counterbalance the sharp Anti-Judaism of St. Paul by a make-weight of a mild and conciliatory nature in favour of the Judaisers and in the interests of unity. But now we find Hilgenfeld, the foremost representative of the Tübingen school, accepting these two chapters, even defending them against the different hypotheses which have been suggested to account for them,[1] whilst Weizsäcker (Baur's successor at Tübingen), although he regards the sixteenth chapter as containing a commendatory letter for Phœbe to the Church at Ephesus,[2] accepts both it (with the exception of the last four verses) and the fifteenth chapter as authentic, attaches great weight to the personal

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 321–7. Nothing could be more emphatic than Hilgenfeld's judgment: 'Allen diesen Hypothesen gegenüber meine ich die Aechtheit von Röm. c. 15, 16 mit guten Gründen, welche nicht vollständig wiederholt zu werden brauchen, aufrecht erhalten zu haben.' And he adds in a note, 'Z. f. w. Th. 1872, iv. pp. 469-95, *womit Pfleiderer* ("*Paulinismus*," S. 314) *sich einverstanden erklärt hat.*' It must not, of course, be forgotten that both Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer reject the final doxology in xvi. 25–27. 'Von dem ganzen Römerbriefs lassen sich nur die drei letzen Verse dem Paulus absprechen' (Hilgenfeld, *ubi supra*, p. 326).

[2] For a similar hypothesis, cf. Renan's *Saint Paul*, Introd., pp. 68 ff. Cf. also Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 183, 184, where, after remarking that nothing in these two chapters authorises the doubts which Baur raised against their authenticity, he adopts Renan's view as the most satisfactory—viz. that they formed a kind of circular letter, part of which was specially addressed to Ephesus. See also Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 13 and 428–30.

allusions which they contain, and speaks of Andronicus and Junia as examples of the fact that Jews who had belonged to the primitive Church, and had not been disciples of Paul, were yet united with him in a common work, and served a common gospel.[1]

Every student of Apologetic Theology in England is aware how much stress has been recently laid upon what is called 'the argument from the Pauline Epistles' for the historical basis of the life of Jesus. This argument has been confined, for the most part, to those four Epistles which are regarded as practically undisputed,[2] but the course of modern criticism increasingly justifies us in adding to the number at least three others, 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon, and, in part, the Epistle to the Colossians. At a time, indeed, when the names of certain continental critics are persistently put forward as names wherewith to conjure, and when it is persistently assumed that the result of their efforts has been to destroy the belief in the traditional

[1] Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 190, 332, 335, 438. A full history of the criticism relating to this part of the Romans will be found in Holtzmann's *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 269–274. He points out that, amongst others, not only Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer, but Schenkel (*Bib. Lex.* v. 113) and Reuss (*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 103–5, 6. Aufl. 1887) have defended the two chapters as Pauline. (Comp. Mangold, in Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 547; and, for a summary of views, Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, i. 153–7, 2nd edit.), although in most cases the final doxology is given up. Cf. also B. Weiss, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 247–9, 2. Aufl. It will be noticed that Dr. Weiss, whilst he regards Romans xvi. 1–20 as a separate letter of recommendation to Phœbe for Ephesus which found its way into the Roman Epistle, because on her way to Ephesus she herself passed through Rome and brought it thither, refuses to accept the view of Ewald and others that this recommendatory letter begins at xvi. 3, and dates from the time of the Roman captivity, a view which seems to deprive us of every natural explanation as to how such a letter gained a place in our Roman Epistle; that he accepts the final doxology as genuine; and that in his second edition he lays stress upon the fact that Reuss is at one with him in this conclusion. For a still more recent exposition of the views of Dr. Weiss, see Meyer's *Römerbrief*, pp. 35–8, 8. Aufl. (edited by Weiss) 1891. To the above authorities, we may add R. A. Lipsius, who is prepared to accept almost the entire chap. xv. as genuine, and to regard chap. xvi. 1–20 as part of a letter to the church at Ephesus; vv. 21–4 he considers to have formed the original conclusion of the Roman Epistle, and the final doxology, vv. 25–7, to be a later addition (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* pp. 74, 75, Freiburg, 1891).

[2] A review of recent objections to these Epistles will be found in chap. iii.

authorship of the books of the New Testament, it is well to remember that, at least with regard to the Pauline Epistles, such appeals are one-sided, and such assumptions unwarrantable.

There is, for example, one name which still stands in the front rank amongst the many distinguished Biblical critics and historians of Germany—the name of the late Heinrich Ewald. Here at least is a writer, it might be thought, whose *dictum* would carry weight even with rationalists. But whether because of his uncompromising defence of the Fourth Gospel, or because he does not hesitate to tell us that nothing is more historical than the appearance of the Risen Lord to His disciples,[1] no stress whatever is laid upon his name in recent popular controversies.

What, let us ask, is the judgment of Ewald upon the Epistles which bear the name of St. Paul? If we refer to his 'Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus,' we find that he admits not only the four Epistles, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, but also *both* Epistles to the Thessalonians (although he transposes their order), Philippians, Philemon, and even with regard to the Colossians he concludes that it was written, if not by Paul himself, by some amanuensis like Timothy, just as he supposes that 1 Peter was transcribed by Silvanus.[2,3]

But we turn to another name—the name of a great theologian also recently passed away, who may be said to have represented both French and German criticism, and whose works have played a prominent part in at least one recent controversy in England—Edouard Reuss of Strasburg.

[1] *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 444, 445.

[2] It is, of course, fair to state that Ewald rejected the Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles. Cf. his *Sieben Sendschreiben des Neuen Bundes*.

[3] Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 1–12, 17, 18, 33, 34, 56, 101–7, 223–33, 314–20, 428–30, 431, 432, 460–2, 466–9. For the Epistle to the Colossians, cf. especially pp. 11–13, and pp. 467–9. After discussing the question of authorship, he adds: 'Aber noch bleibt die Annahme, dass Paulus die Abfassung des Schreibens selbst, nachdem durch vorläufige Besprechung sein Inhalt festgestellt war, dem Timotheos überlassen habe, welcher ja als Mitverfasser in der Zuschrift i. 1 genannt wird. Und in der That löst diese Annahme alle obigen Räthsel, und erweist sich nach allen Seiten hin als die richtige.'

In addition to the four 'practically non-disputed' Epistles, Reuss accepts *both* the Epistles to the Thessalonians, and the Epistle to the Philippians;[1] no one has more stoutly defended the Colossians and Ephesians, with the exquisite letter to Philemon, against the attacks of the Tübingen school;[2] and although in his Commentary ('Les Epîtres Pauliniennes,' 1878, ii. 243, 307) he rejects 1 Timothy and Titus, he still admits 2 Timothy, which he had previously described, as of all the Pauline Epistles assailed by criticism the one which bears most plainly the stamp of genuineness, with the single exception of the letter to Philemon.[3]

[1] It is quite refreshing to read the pages in which Reuss dismisses the doubts raised against 2 Thess., the rejection of which by negative critics has become a kind of dogma, equally with their acceptance of 1 Thess.; and in his defence of the Philippians there is a wholesome reproof in the remark that criticism fails of its end in a special degree when it bases a verdict of rejection against the whole Epistle upon a single dogmatic digression, which it cannot understand, or which it does not like. (*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.*, pp. 76–79, and 128, 6. Aufl. 1887.)

[2] *Geschichte der H.S. des N. T.* pp. 110–119, 6. Aufl. Amongst recent defenders of the Epistle to the Colossians we may now rank H. v. Soden, an important addition. In the *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* (of which he is joint-editor) he examines the usual objections raised against the Epistle, and concludes that neither its language nor its dogmatic expressions afford sufficient ground to reject the Pauline authorship; he places the date of the Epistle in the Apostle's first Roman imprisonment. (*Hand-Commentar*, iii. pp. 14, 17, 1891.)

[3] Reuss, *ubi supra*, § 123. The fate experienced by the little Epistle to Philemon affords us a curious glimpse into the workings and exigencies of the negative criticism, and we may well say with Reuss (p. 120) that the very fact that criticism has presumed to question the genuineness of these harmless lines only shows us that itself is not the genuine thing. No one has spoken more warmly in praise of this practical note to Philemon, and its charming Christian spirit, than Baur (*Paulus*, ii. 82), and when, in spite of this eulogy, he proceeds to assert that we have here the germ of a Christian romance, which was afterwards elaborated into the recognition and reunion scenes of the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, he fails to convince even his own followers. The real truth is that the Epistle to Philemon is indissolubly connected with the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, and carries with it the acceptance of at least the former of these two Epistles (cf. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 203, and Renan, *St. Paul*, Introd. p. xi). 'If the Epistle [to the Colossians] is apocryphal, the note [*i.e.* to Philemon] is apocryphal also . . . yet Paul alone, as it appears to us, could write the little masterpiece.'

The close connection between the three Epistles is well expressed by Sabatier in his chapter upon them, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 201–210. 'Ces trois lettres forment un groupe distinct dans l'ensemble des épitres de la captivité, et ne doivent point être séparées. Ecrites en même temps, très-vraisemblablement de la prison de

The testimony of M. Renan with regard to the Pauline Epistles is perhaps better known in England than that of any other continental critic, and it is therefore only necessary to remind ourselves that of thirteen Pauline Epistles he positively rejects only three—the Pastoral Epistles—whilst he classes the Ephesians as *probably* spurious, and Colossians and Philemon as *probably* authentic, although doubtful. The three Epistles which he places in the second class, viz. 1 and 2 Thes-

Césarée, portées en Asie Mineure par les mêmes messagers, elles gardent des traces frappantes de cette parenté d'origine (*Philem.* 10; cf. *Col.* iv. 9; *Philem.* 23, 24; cf. *Col.* iv. 10, 12, 14; *Philem.* 2; cf. *Col.* iv. 17; *Col.* iv. 7; cf. *Eph.* vi. 21). Ces épîtres, en effet, se supposent l'une l'autre, et il devient bientôt évident qu'elles ont eu un seul et même auteur.'

After a humorous exposition (p. 203) of Baur's attitude towards the letter to Philemon, in which, beneath its air of innocence and candour, he claims to have discovered a mysterious design, and the working of an ambitious dogmatic idea, Sabatier expresses the importance of the letter in question in the words which conclude the same page: 'Attachée, dès l'origine, aux deux autres épîtres (*Colossiens*, *Ephésiens*), elle est, pour elles, comme la signature même de Paul qui les accompagne à travers les siècles pour les garantir.'

Sabatier points out with much force, that the way in which Baur insisted upon a recognition of one and the same author of both Ephesians and Colossians, almost annihilated the objections of De Wette to the former Epistle, and his conclusion that it was the work of a forger who tried to imitate the earlier Pauline Epistle, viz. in the Colossians. For De Wette's criticism on the Ephesians cf. *Lehrbuch der historischen-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des N. T.* pp. 309–321. De Wette accepted the Colossians, p. 307.

The ingenious theory of Holtzmann that a part of the Colossians is a genuine letter of St. Paul (a remarkable concession from such a negative critic), that a forger worked this up into the Ephesians, and that then, pleased with his performance, he produced our present Colossian Epistle by interpolations from his own forgery (Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, 1886, pp. 290–297) had been answered in Germany by B. Weiss in the *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1872, 4, in reply to Holtzmann's first announcement of his views in his *Kritik der Epheser und Colosser Briefe*, Leipsic, 1872. For the course of German criticism on this theory see Weiss, *Einleitung*, pp. 259, 260, 2. Aufl., and Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the N. T.* pp. 479–81; and for its untenableness, in addition to the above, see *Quarterly Review*, October 1886, on *Historical Criticism of the N. T.* p. 478 &c.

Cf. also Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 210: 'On a essayé de découvrir un noyau authentique dans l'épître aux Colossiens, à l'aide duquel un écrivain postérieur aurait d'abord rédigé l'épître aux Ephésiens, et, pour mieux cacher son jeu, ce même écrivain serait ensuite revenu à la lettre de Paul et l'aurait amplifiée librement pour la rendre mieux conforme à sa propre œuvre. L'histoire et encore plus une exégèse sans préjugés condamnent cette étrange solution dont le moindre embarras est d'être irréalisable.'

On the relative priority of the two Epistles cf. Reuss's *Geschichte*, p. 111, Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 208, and B. Weiss, *Einleitung*, pp. 267, 268.

salonians and Philippians, he admits as authentic in his own judgment, although, as a critic, he points out that certain difficulties have been raised against them.[1]

But it will be noted that what Renan mentions as the chief difficulty, viz. the theory of the Antichrist in 2 Thessalonians ii.—a difficulty which he himself regards as by no means insuperable—also admits of solution in the judgment of Schenkel in his discussion of the two Thessalonian Epistles,[2] and it is important to bear in mind that Schenkel not only admits 1 and 2 Thessalonians and Philippians, but also that he is prepared to accept the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians.[3]

[1] Renan, *Saint Paul*, 12th edit. 1888. The Epistles are arranged in five classes: '1. Epîtres incontestables et incontestées; ce sont l'épître aux Galates, les deux épîtres aux Corinthiens, l'épître aux Romains; 2. Epîtres certaines, quoiqu'on y ait fait quelques objections; ce sont les deux épitres aux Thessaloniens et l'épître aux Philippiens; 3. Epîtres d'une authenticité probable, quoiqu'on y ait fait de graves objections; c'est l'épitre aux Colossiens, qui a pour annexe le billet à Philémon; 4. Epître douteux; c'est l'épitre dite aux Ephesiéns; 5. Epîtres fausses; ce sont les deux épîtres à Timothée et l'épître à Tite' (p. 6). With regard to the 2nd class, 1 and 2 Thess. and Philippians, Renan remarks: 'A peine insisterons-nous même sur les épîtres de la deuxième classe. Les difficultés que certains modernes ont soulevées contre elles sont de ces soupçons légers que le devoir de la critique est d'exprimer librement, mais sans s'y arrêter, quand de plus fortes raisons l'entrainent. Or, ces trois épitres ont un caractère d'authenticité qui l'emporte sur toute autre considération' (p. 6). And after discussing the objections against Colossians, he adds: 'Rien de tout cela cependant n'est décisif. Si l'épître aux Colossiens (comme nous le croyons) est l'ouvrage de Paul, elle fut écrite dans les derniers temps de la vie de l'apôtre, à une date où sa biographie est bien obscure' (p. 9).

[2] *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, pp. 68, 69.

[3] In mentioning the doubts which have been raised against the three Epistles, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon, Schenkel points out that Colossians cannot be separated from Philemon, an Epistle which bears upon its face the stamp of authenticity (p. 84). He considers (pp. 85, 86) that the altered circumstances of the Apostle go far to account for the difference in tone between these Epistles of the captivity and St. Paul's earlier writings, and he adds two important notes in connection with the theory of Holtzmann which has been already mentioned. In the first note he points out the fact that the Pauline character of the Colossian Epistle is not denied even by those who oppose its authenticity or integrity, and after mentioning Holtzmann's ingenious attempt to restore the original Epistle, he refers to the admissions made by Pfleiderer of much that is really Pauline both in the beginning and in the second half of the Epistle (*Paulinismus*, p. 370).

On the Philippians he writes (p. 91): 'Auch die eingehenden und lehrreichen Untersuchungen Holsten's . . . haben meine Ueberzeugung von der Echtheit dieses Briefes nicht zu erschüttern vermocht.' See also on the three Epistles, pp. 298–301.

Even if we put the last two Epistles out of the question, we find that both Hilgenfeld and Weizsäcker accept seven of the Pauline Epistles, viz. 1 Thessalonians, Philemon, and Philippians, in addition to the four placed by Renan in the first class.[1]

The importance of the admission of two of these documents, the First Epistle to the Thessalonians and the Epistle to the Philippians, will be shown, it is hoped, in the following pages, and we may notice in passing that in England even the most negative criticism is compelled to accept them.[2] But if so, it is no longer fair in examining St. Paul's testimony to argue from the standpoint of Baur, and the early Tübingen school,[3] as if modern German scholarship had never got beyond it, espe-

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, pp. 239, 246), 'In dem ganzen Briefe (1 Thess.) erkennt man die Sprache des Paulus. Es ist kein Grund vorhanden, denselben dem Paulus abzusprechen' (246). After speaking of the scruples which prevented Holtzmann from entirely rejecting Philemon he adds (331): 'Der ganze Brief trägt das Gepräge der einfachen Wahrheit an sich und verräth auch in den Wortspielen, v. 11, 20, die Schreibart des Paulus'; and after criticising the Philippians he concludes (347): 'Die Aechtheit des Philipperbriefs ist also nicht wirklich widerlegt worden. In diesem Briefe haben wir den Schwanengesang des Paulus.' Cf. also his emphatic remarks in *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* p. 199, 1871. Weizsäcker, after admitting that it is not so easy to reject the Colossians as the Ephesians, and after entirely dismissing the Pastoral Epistles, maintains most decisively the authenticity of 1 Thess. and Philippians. 'Von den übrigen Briefen müssen wir nur noch den zweiten nach Thessalonike bei Seite lassen, der zu offenbar das Gepräge einer Nachahmung hat . . . nach überwiegenden Gründen stammen von ihm auch der erste Brief nach Thessalonike, und der nach Philippi.' *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 190.

For the doubts raised by Weizsäcker against 2 Thess. on the ground that it is an imitation of 1 Thess., see his *Apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 258–261, and cf. B. Weiss's criticism of this view in his *Einleitung*, 2. Aufl. pp. 176, 177. Cf. also Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 86–88; Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, pp. 38, 39. In addition to the testimonies given above in favour of Phil. the Epistle is emphatically defended and accepted by Mangold, in his edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 568, 569, 1886; by Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 302–304, 2. Aufl. 1886; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 14 note; Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, pp. 153, 1887. For the most recent examination of the attacks made upon the Epistle, and for their refutation, see *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. B., 2. Abtheilung, pp. 195–197 (edited by R. A. Lipsius), Freiburg, 1891.

[2] Martineau, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 180: 'Of the New Testament writings, six letters of Paul, viz. 1 Thess., Gal., Rom., 1 and 2 Cor., and Phil., must have the full benefit of the presumption which accepts a book on its own word.'

[3] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, Introd. pp. ix, x.

cially when we remember that one of the foremost of German critical theologians of the present day is prepared to accept the whole of the Pauline Epistles, not even excepting those three Pastoral Epistles against which modern doubts have been raised most frequently.[1] And yet his 'honoured' name is dismissed in a recent popular review of the results of German criticism with a single passing remark!

But even if we should confine our attention to the four Epistles which Renan places in his first class (the *Hauptbriefe*, as the Germans call them), they present to more than one very common objection a solid block of historical evidence. Thus, in spite of the remarkable concessions of German rationalistic criticism,[2] it is still constantly asserted that we know nothing of our Gospels until the middle of the second century. But the Epistles of St. Paul, even if we restrict our attention to 'the four chief Epistles,' presuppose the story of the Gospels—they are justly cited by Christian apologists as a substantial proof that the story was known in all its main features within some twenty-eight years, at the latest, of our Lord's death—known, too, in Churches so widely apart as Rome, Corinth, and Galatia; they carry us back, moreover, to a much earlier date still, for there is no reason whatever to suppose that St. Paul is preaching the great facts of the life and

[1] See B. Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 122, 2. Aufl. 1889, for the conclusion of his examination of the Pastoral Epistles.

[2] We may refer, *e.g.*, to the remarks of Weiss in his *Leben Jesu*, i. 160, 161, where, after speaking of the late date assigned by the Tübingen school to the Gospels, he adds that on this point a healthy reaction has recently begun. The origin of our Gospels is by no means so obscure, and their dates so uncertain, that in accordance with the necessity of the judgment which has been formed as to the unhistorical character of their contents, a place can be assigned to them at pleasure in the second century. Even Volkmar places the Gospel of St. Matthew, which he considered the latest of our three older Gospels, more than twenty years earlier than the head of the school, although the latter considered it as the oldest; Volkmar places 'the first great doctrinal fiction' concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God, our Gospel of Mark, three years after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 73; see also Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 482, 499, 2. Aufl. 1889. For Volkmar's own statement see *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 18, 19. We have only to consider the dates assigned to the Gospels by Baur, and the dates now adopted by Holtzmann, to see a further justification of Weiss's remark as to the reaction. Cf. 'Historical Criticism of the New Testament,' p. 479 in *Quarterly Review*, October 1886.

death and resurrection of Christ to those who had never heard them before (see below, Chapter V.); if so, he would not have been in a position to draw so many practical lessons from them, and to take for granted their universal acceptance.

There is thus abundant justification for the emphatic declaration of Dr. Salmon :—

'If I were lecturing on Christian Evidences, I should commence my examination of the books of the New Testament with the Epistles of St. Paul. There are some of these which are owned to be genuine by the most sceptical critics, and these universally admitted Epistles are rich in autobiographical details, and set Paul vividly before us as a real, living, working character. . . . Bring down the date of the Gospels as low as the most courageous of our adversaries can venture to bring them, and though we thus lose the proof of the greater part of the wonderful works of the Saviour's life, the great miracle of the Resurrection remains untouched. Take St. Paul's abridged account of the gospel he had received, as given in an unquestioned Epistle, and though it is so much shorter than any of the four, it contains quite as much stumbling-block for an anti-supernaturalist.'[1]

It has, indeed, been said, that although Christian apologists have lately made it a favourite argument to appeal to the four undisputed Epistles of St. Paul, they do not always meet the certain objection that the Epistles show only what were the convictions of St. Paul, and that he was in opposition to believers of older standing.[2]

This objection has by no means been forgotten in the succeeding chapters. But we may remark in passing, that if we consider the testimony of these four Epistles with reference to our Lord's life and teaching, it is evident throughout

[1] *Introd. to the N. T.* pp. 30, 31, 5th edit. 1891. With Dr. Salmon's remark that with Paul's testimony in 1 Cor. xv. 5–7, 'Christianity thus could survive the loss of the Gospels,' we may compare Schmid, *Biblische Theologie des N. T.* pp. 12, 24, 5. Aufl. 1886 (edited by C. Weizsäcker); Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 15; C. Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* (see below). English readers will recall Dr. Sanday's remarks in the *Reading Church Congress Report*, pp. 94, 95, and, more recently, Mr. Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 58, ff.

[2] Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 155. But see Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 61.

that St. Paul is at one with the first Apostles in the leading facts of the Gospel which he preached; that the primitive Church of Jerusalem never ceases to command his respect; and that the other Apostles are not regarded by him in the light of mere personal opponents, but always as the Apostles of the Lord.[1]

And if we turn for a moment to their Christology, it is

[1] See Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 225; and esp. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zeitalter*, p. 366. Comp. Hilgenfeld's opening remarks in *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie*, p. 358, 1890. One of the most important epochs in the controversy with the Tübingen school was marked by the publication of Albrecht Ritschl's second edition of his *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 1857, in which he declared his total antagonism to the fundamental principles of Baur and Schwegler; his remarks, *e.g.*, on p. 51 (comp. also p. 48) are of the utmost importance in showing how utterly he disclaimed the maintenance of any fundamental opposition between Paul and the primitive Apostles: 'Nach Maassgabe dieser Andeutungen sind wir weit davon entfernt, einen fundamentalen Gegensatz zwischen Paulus und den Urapposteln vorauszusetzen. In diesem Falle hätten sie die gemeinsame Geschichte nicht haben können, welche sie nach den von Niemand bezweifelten Dokumenten gehabt haben. Einen praktischen Gegensatz zwischen Beiden werden wir freilich anerkennen müssen, aber das Feld desselben wird eine so enge Abgrenzung finden, dass die wesentliche Uebereinstimmung in den von Christus aufgestellten leitenden Ideen nur um so deutlicher einleuchten wird.'

So, too, Sabatier (*L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 7), in discussing the agreement of St. Paul with the disciples of older standing, reminds us that the Apostle speaks of the first Christian community as 'the Church of God,' and once, simply as 'the Church' (Gal. i. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 6, Phil. iii. 6); that he calls the first Christians 'the brethren' and 'the saints' (1 Cor. xv. 6, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, Rom. xv. 31), and sets them before the members of the Church of Thessalonica as worthy models for imitation. 'For ye, brethren, became followers of *the churches of God which in Judæa are in Christ Jesus*' (1 Thess. ii. 12–14).

On such passages as 1 Cor. iii. 22 and 1 Cor. xv. 11 and their testimony to the fundamental agreement between St. Paul and the Twelve, see Lechler, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 486–8. 3 Aufl.

The same passages are examined by Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 9, 10. In this connection we may refer to some of the closing remarks of Huraut (see chap. ii.) in his *Paul, a-t-il connu le Christ historique?* p. 46: 'La foi qu'il [Saint Paul] a prêchée, c'est elle qu'il renversait autrefois (Gal. i. 23), comprenant bien qu'elle ruinait les traditions de ses pères, et montrant par là qu'il comprenait mieux que nos critiques modernes toute la partie du Christianisme anté-paulinien; c'est celle qui l'a fait regarder comme un frère par les Apôtres mêmes auxquels on l'oppose, et qui lui ont donné la main d'association, reconnaissant que s'ils étaient, lui et eux, séparés sur des points de détail sans importance, ils étaient unis, fondamentalement unis, sur ce qui fait l'essence même du Christianisme. Et de même que Saint Paul pouvait dire aux Corinthiens *Soit donc moi, soit eux, nous prêchons ainsi et vous avez cru ainsi*, les Apôtres auraient pu dire: *Soit donc nous, soit lui, nous prêchons ainsi et vous avez cru ainsi.*'

manifest that St. Paul is at one, not only with the Church of Jerusalem, but with those who disputed his authority, in regarding Jesus as *the Lord*. Take, *e.g.*, his remark in Gal. i. 19, 'But other of the Apostles saw I none, save James *the Lord's brother*'; here St. Paul evidently uses a title already familiar to the Church of Jerusalem, and which carries us back to a much earlier date than the Epistle; or if we refer to 1 Cor. ix. 1, 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ *our Lord*?' is it not evident that such an appeal presupposes that his opponents held the same opinion as his own with regard to Christ's Person?[1] Certainly if the early Tübingen criticism is correct, the rise of a higher Christology is to be referred to St. Paul: the other Apostles must have had rather Ebionite views of the Person of Jesus, but the less Paul knew of the historical Christ, the more dogmatic the position which he could take up with regard to Him. It is very difficult to understand how men can entertain this opinion and yet ascribe the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, since in no writing of the New Testament is a higher Christology exhibited than in the Apocalypse.[2] But even one such passage as Galatians i. 19, shows us that St. Paul was by no means unacquainted with, or indifferent to, the facts of the human life of Jesus; and whilst he does not hesitate to speak of Him as *the Lord* (on the significance of this term see Chapter IV.) he also associates Him with human surroundings, and describes Him as a brother among brethren (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 5).[3]

[1] Cf. Lechler, *ubi supra*, p. 521. St. Paul, even in his keenest attack upon the Judaisers (see Galatians), nowhere implies that they erred in their conception of the Person of Christ, though they did not truly understand the significance of the work of Christ. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 156.

[2] Paret, in *Jahr. f. deutsche Theol.*, 1858; *Paulus und Jesus*, i. p. 7. (For Paret, see chap. ii.)

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 11 and 19. 'Ausserdem begegnen wir Brüdern des Herrn, welche, gleich den Aposteln, verheirathet waren, und mit ihren Weibern als an Jesum, den Herrn, gläubige umherzogen (1 Cor. ix. 5). Einer derselben, Jakobus, wird Gal. i. 19 mit Namen genannt. Paulus muss also Jesum in dieser rein menschlichen Umgebung seinen Gemeinden vorgeführt haben; denn alle diese Erwähnungen kommen nur gelegentlich vor und setzen voraus, dass den Lesern dieses Alles schon wohl bekannt sei. *Und doch bei all dem hat er ihn als den Herrn in jenem hohen Sinne (in welchem er eben bei Paulus immer so genannt wird) festghalten, und seinen Hörern geschildert.*'

But it may also be maintained that this same line of argument from the Pauline Epistles is valid against the 'mythical' and 'legendary' theories, which still seem to be relied on to a great extent by writers who are compelled to place the Gospels at a far earlier date than that assumed by Strauss or Baur.[1] Certainly it would seem that there is often some confusion in the use of these terms 'mythical' and 'legendary,' and the question has been fairly raised whether the word 'myth' can strictly be employed in this connection at all.[2]

[1] See, for example, the opening pages of Holtzmann's recent *Die Synoptiker*, 1889, pp. 20, 53, 54. *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i.

[2] The myth, as Weiss points out (*Leben Jesu*, i. 146), has, strictly speaking, no application at all to the Gospel history, since this turns upon the historical person of Jesus, while it is of the essence of a myth to be a pure ideal conception. And he reminds us with truth that, if this is the case, we must first, with Bruno Bauer, call in question the historical existence of the person of Jesus, and see in Him simply the embodiment of the form of the Messiah as it was shaped by the religious consciousness of the Church, to be able to explain *as pure myth* the narrative concerning Him. It is just this *naïveté* of the myth-forming consciousness which, in Dr. Weiss's judgment, is entirely lost sight of when a distinction is drawn between the religious or philosophic myth and the historical myth (pp. 146, 149). The former might be taken into serious account, if, in approaching the story of the Gospels, we had to deal with an age and a people like that which meets us in the formation of some heathen mythology. But the reverse is the case, and we have to face an historical period—a period, as has been said, as historic as any that the ancient world presents to view. (See Dr. W. H. Mill on *The Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, pp. 97, 98.)

The same argument is expressed by Hettinger in his *Lehrbuch der Fundamental-Theologie oder Apologetik*, 1879, pp. 291, 292: 'Die Mythenbildung gehört der vorhistorischen Zeit an, die weder Schrift, noch Geschichte, noch Chronologie hat. Die Evangelien dagegen erscheinen in einer Zeit des regsten historischen Bewusstseins, als Griechenland seinen Thukydides, Rom seinen Livius und bald darauf Tacitus besass, über Palästina Flavius Josephus, über Aegypten Manetho, über Phönicien Dios und Menander, über Herodes Ptolemäus der Mendisier geschrieben hatten.' Such words recall the familiar remark, 'The idea of men writing mythic histories between the time of Livy and Tacitus, and St. Paul mistaking such for realities!' (Arnold, *Life*, ii. 58).

With Hettinger, we may compare the similar line of thought more fully expressed by C. Ullmann in his *Historisch oder Mythisch?* pp. 52–5, from which it will be of interest to quote a few sentences, since it was the book which influenced Strauss himself to make considerable concessions (Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology*, p. 220): '*Vorerst sollte der Ausdruck Mythus hier lieber ganz vermieden werden.* Er führt fast unausbleiblich eine Vermischung verschiedenartiger Gebiete mit sich. Wir sind nun einmal gewohnt vorzugsweise die heidinischen Religionsdarstellungen Mythen zu nennen . . . wir befinden uns dabei entschieden auf dem *vorhistorischen* Gebiete und ganz im Kreise einer durch

Indeed, in one of the most recent and powerful of the many *Lives of Jesus* which German theology has given us, it is recognised that the question is not between 'mythical' and 'legendary,' but whether, when either theory is applied to the Gospels, some other word ought not to be used—whether, in reality, it is not a moral question, a question affecting the moral character of Christ, or at least of His immediate followers.[1]

Certainly after the rise of the Tübingen school, with their description of the Gospels as 'tendency' writings, the early position of Strauss was no longer tenable, since conscious invention, invention creating freely, and with deliberate purpose, had taken the place of the unconscious products of the imagination, and of that naïve interchange of idea and actuality which considers that what is necessarily thought, must have necessarily happened.[2]

Strauss himself unhesitatingly refers to Baur's influence

geschichtsform anschaulich gemachten, gleichsam personificirten Physik und Naturreligion. *Mit dem Christenthume dagegen betreten wir ein vollkommen anderes Gebiet;* hier herrscht nicht ein physikalisches, sondern ein durch und durch ethisches Interesse, hier befinden wir uns nicht mehr in dem kindlichen Alter der freien, unbefangenen religiösen Dichtung, *sondern in einem vorgeschrittenen, schriftstellerischen, gebildeten, ja theilweise überbildeten, überhaupt aber in einem historischen Zeitalter.*'

On the distinction between *myth* and *legend*, and the fallacy of Strauss's position in not fully recognising the distinction between them, see Dr. A. S. Farrar's *Critical History of Free Thought*, pp. 328, 379, 380; and for a recent exposition of the fact that myths properly so called must be restricted in their rise to the earliest and most uncivilised ages, we may refer to Mr. Andrew Lang's *Myth, Religion, and Ritual*, i. 3, 21, 29, 33, 37, 51. 'From all these efforts of civilised and pious believers to explain away the stories about their own gods, we may infer one fact—the most important to the student of mythology—the fact that myths were not evolved in times of clear civilised thought' (p. 3).

[1] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 158, 159, and 148, 149. 'A fiction, which consciously attributes to freely-constructed details the significance of actual facts, is no longer a fiction but a lying invention. This hypothesis, therefore, ends of necessity with discrediting the moral character of the Evangelists.' 'Eine Erdichtung aber, welche mit Bewusstsein frei geschaffenen Zügen die Bedeutung thatsächlicher beilegt, ist keine Dichtung mehr, sondern eine lügenhafte Erfindung. So endet diese Hypothese nothwendig mit der Anzweiflung des sittlichen Charakters der Evangelisten.' We may compare with this the equally strong language of Dr. W. H. Mill, *ubi supra*, p. 98, and note 4 on the same page, and, more recently, Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 81, 1891.

[2] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 155.

in his 'Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk,' published nearly thirty years after his first 'Leben Jesu,' and acknowledges that in his later work far more scope is conceded to the element of conscious invention—invention with a purpose. He still, however, maintains that the word 'myth' is justifiable, and continues to speak of an historical myth; whether it be conscious or unconscious is all the same thing. If it has found acceptance, then the term 'myth' may be safely applied to it, even though it is a conscious invention, since the fact of its acceptance showed that it had been formed in connection with the consciousness of the time. Although he admits that in the domain of Grecian mythology conscious invention may have no place, he affirms that critical theology classes under the head of 'myths' all those Gospel narratives which have only an ideal significance[1]; he holds, moreover, that this conscious invention may be found, and in our Gospels is found, side by side with the best and purest motives, and quite apart from any fraudulent intention.[2]

But whether we adopt the language of English writers like W. H. Mill, or of Weiss and Hettinger in Germany,[3] it is evident that Strauss felt obliged to modify his theory under the influence of the Tübingen school, and that the Gospel narratives could no longer be explained as pure myths.

[1] See his *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. 199–202, 5. Aufl.

[2] Strauss, *ubi supra*, pp. 195–198.

[3] Hettinger, *Fundamental-Theologie*, i. 292. Hettinger points out that even in his first *Leben Jesu* Strauss could not explain the origin of the Gospels from unintentional poetical legends, and that men of his own school recognised that such legends could not have created reports filled with so many exact and circumstantial details. The Gospels could, therefore, only be explained in one of two ways: either we must accept them as trustworthy, or we must reckon them as 'tendency' writings. After pointing out that Baur decided for the latter, and attempted to prove his theory by assigning a date to our Gospels which the concessions of later critics have rendered untenable (p. 293, and authors quoted), he adds with reference to the change in Strauss' view: 'Auch Strauss, *wenn er gleich das Wort Mythus noch festhielt*, gab in seinem *Leben Jesu für das d. Volk* "der absichtlichen Dichtung mehr Raum," wiewohl er diese früher entschieden verworfen hatte. *Er legte dem Worte Mythus einen andern Sinn unter*; auch bewusste Dichtungen sind ihm Mythen, "sobald sie Glauben gefunden haben und in Zusammenhange mit dem Bewusstsein einer Wahrheit gebildet wurden."'

But it will be noticed that there are other respects in which the alleged evangelical 'myths' answer neither to the tests nor conditions which Strauss himself proposes. In the first place, it was well pointed out by C. Ullmann, in language which shows how keenly he felt and recognised the force of the argument from the Pauline writings, that even the undisputed Epistles of the Apostle are quite sufficient to destroy the mythical theory, since their early date cuts at the root of that element of *time* which is essential for the growth of the myth, and since they presuppose the chief facts of the Gospels as a firm and unshaken historical basis: these Epistles and their author remain—an opposing rock which cannot be rolled away—even if Strauss had been successful in his criticism of the Gospel sources.[1] Even if these Epistles, and others in the New Testament, witnessed less than they do to the great facts of the Gospels,[2] their testimony might well cause the advocates of the mythical theory to reconsider their position. 'It would most unquestionably,' writes Strauss, 'be an argument of decisive weight in favour of the credibility of the Biblical history, could it indeed be shown that it was written by eye-witnesses, *or even by persons nearly contemporaneous with the events narrated*.'[3] 'For though errors and false representations may glide into the narratives even of an eye-witness, *there is far less probability of unintentional mistakes* (*intentional deception may easily be detected*) *than where*

[1] Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* pp. 56, 57, 144, 145: 'Setzen wir aber auch für den Augenblick, dass Strauss die Quellenkritik zum Ziele gebracht, und haltbare Rusultate geliefert hätte, *so bleibt doch ein Fels liegen, den er nicht wohl hinweg wälzen kann—der Apostel Paulus und die paulinischen Schriften.* Die meisten und wichtigsten paulinischen Briefe sind ihrer Aechtheit und Ursprünglichkeit nach über jeden Zweifel erhaben, und auch Strauss kann dies nicht in Abrede stellen' (p. 56). Cf. also, Keim, *Geschichte Jesu für weitere Kreise*, pp. 20, 21, 1875; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 68, 1887; Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 81, 1891.

Compare Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* Art. 'Mythus.' The conclusion of the article deals with the importance of the Pauline Epistles in their bearing upon the mythical theory.

[2] Strauss, in his *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, still does his best to minimise the value of Paul's testimony to the facts of the Gospels, as well as to the great miracle of the Resurrection. Cf. *e.g.* i. 66, and 379–85.

[3] Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, 4th edit. E. T., p. 55.

the narrator is separated by a long interval from the facts he records.' The words italicised in these paragraphs reveal the assumption which underlies the whole theory of Strauss, an assumption which the existence of the Pauline Epistles entirely refutes, but which Strauss felt to be the mainstay of his position, since he devotes so long a space to the attempt to prove the late date of our Gospels.[1]

How this same difficulty pressed upon Dr. Loman will be seen in Chapter III., and to what straits he was driven to get rid of the testimony of these Pauline Epistles to the Apostle, who became a psychological puzzle, if he was only removed from Jesus by such a brief interval of time.[2]

Yet, even in describing what he must have regarded as the chief factor in his work, the pure myths in which the Messianic ideas and superstitions of the Jewish people irresistibly embodied themselves in narrative form, Strauss is obliged to presuppose that the greater part of these myths already existed in the Old Testament, and that a comparatively small portion of them was entirely new—they had

[1] ' Die ganze Ansicht von Strauss ist nur durchzuführen unter Voraussetzung des kritischen Gewaltstreiches, dass alle vier Evangelien unächt, nicht apostolisch, von späteren unbekannten Männern verfasst seyen. Dies ist aber von Strauss bei weitem nicht zureichend bewiesen ' (Ullmann, *ubi supra*, p. 55).

Dr. Weiss remarks that Strauss well knew what he was about, when, in his latest *Leben Jesu*, he held fast to the views that all our Gospels arose at a time in which, while the memory of a considerable portion of the sayings of Jesus still remained, only the most shadowy outlines of the history of His life were known (Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 160).

The importance of *time* for the growth of a *myth* is also fully pointed out by W. H. Mill, *Mythical Interpretation*, p. 95, and by Hettinger, *ubi supra*, p. 292, comp. Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 198, 1888, Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 80.

With these remarks we may compare Dr. Fairbairn's criticism of the mythical theory in *Contemp. Rev.*, May 1876 : ' The application of the mythical theory to the Gospels was without warrant until justified by the most searching historical and documentary criticism. Precisely here, at the most crucial point, Strauss failed. His criticism of the evangelical histories was not based on a criticism of the evangelical narratives. The questions as to their origin and authenticity are dismissed in a few sentences. The time necessary for the mythical creation is assumed, not proved, to be there. *And this vitiating deficiency involves others. Strauss has no glimpse as to the value of Paul's testimony—does not see that through him we can get too near the sources to leave the mythical faculty room for action.*'

[2] See W. C. van Manen's examination of Loman's hypothesis in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1883, p. 595.

then merely to be *transferred* to Jesus, and accommodated to His character and doctrines.[1] But not only does he thus find the Old Testament totally insufficient without the addition of myths derived from very different sources;[2] not only is he obliged to fall back upon the overwhelming impression made by the Personality of Christ[3] as a factor with which it is impossible to dispense; not only may it be very seriously questioned whether such a definite picture of the Messiah, as he assumes throughout, ever existed at the period of time when Jesus was born,[4] but there is one other objection to which, in the present stage of the controversy as to the sources of the Gospel narratives, special importance is rightly attached.

It is laid down, amongst the *positive* proofs by which a myth may be recognised, that if the contents of a narrative strikingly accord with certain ideas existing and prevailing within the circle from which the narrative proceeded, which ideas themselves seem to be the product of preconceived opinions rather than of practical experience, it is more or less probable, according to circumstances, that such a narrative is of mythical origin.[5]

But what if it can be shown that the Gospel narratives of the Incarnation, the Temptation, the Transfiguration, the Resurrection of our Lord, so far from being 'in striking harmony with some Messianic idea of the Jews of that age,' are in direct opposition to it,[6] and if the same criticism can

[1] Strauss, while he is evidently conscious of this weakness in his theory, still maintains the same position in his *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, 5. Aufl., pp. 194, 195.

[2] See, for example, pp. 38, 39, *ubi supra*, in his treatment of the Incarnation, and compare Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 154; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 377, and below, chap. iii.

[3] The immense importance attaching to the Personality of our Lord, and the utter weakness of excluding it in any attempt to account for the rise of the Christian Church, are most fully expressed by Ullmann in the treatise already mentioned *passim*—a treatise which induced Strauss himself to modify the conclusion of his *Leben Jesu*. See the late Canon Cook's essay on *Ideology and Subscription*, and Pfleiderer's recent account of the book in his *Development of Theology*, p. 221, 1890.

[4] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 152.

[5] Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, p. 94, 4th edit. E.T.

[6] 'Der Charackter der mythischen und evangelischen Erzählung schliessen

be applied to the one great historical fact upon which even critics who refuse to St. Paul any definite acquaintance with the life of Jesus allow that he laid the greatest stress—the fact, not merely of a suffering, but of a crucified Messiah?[1] Take, as a single instance, the incident which Strauss himself chooses as an illustration of the *pure myth*—the Transfiguration of our Lord. The account of it, we are told, is derived 'almost exclusively' from Messianic ideas and expectations existing in the Jewish mind before Jesus, and independently of Him; there was a predisposition to create the whole occurrence by virtue of the current idea of the relation of the Messiah to Moses and Elijah.[2]

But, granting this part of the case, how are we to account for the introduction of the two prophets talking with Jesus as to His 'decease,' which He should shortly accomplish at Jerusalem, the context plainly showing what the decease involved? It would be difficult to conceive any incident more directly opposed to Jewish feeling—indeed, Strauss seemed to have been conscious of the difficulty, for he fixes upon this particular incident as the only amplification taken from the other source of the pure myth—viz. the particular impression which was left by the fate of Jesus, and which served to modify the Messianic idea in the mind of the people.

But a witness whose impartiality will scarcely be questioned has reminded us that even in the second century after

einander vollständig aus. Die Mythe ist das Product des Volksgeistes, *darum national gefärbt*; die Lehre des Evangeliums ist von allgemein menschlichem Interesse, *vielfach im Widerspruche mit dem Glauben des Volkes, in dessen Mitte es erstanden ist.*' Hettinger, *ubi supra*, i. 292.

[1] Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 53. For Jewish ideas and the Incarnation see chap. iv., and for Jewish ideas and the Resurrection see chap. iv. On the contrariety between these ideas and the Gospel narratives of the Temptation see Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 292, 293; and for the same contrariety with regard to the Transfiguration, ii. 100, 101. For a remarkable testimony to the 'scientific value' of Dr. Edersheim's work see Pfleiderer, *Development of Theology*, p. 393.

[2] Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, i. 85, 94, 4th edit. E.T. and his *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, 5. Aufl. ii. 251–255, 256, 257, and especially 255, for the way in which Strauss speaks of the death of Jesus as the chief stumbling-block to Jewish modes of thought, and supposes that the Evangelists introduced Moses and Elias to counteract this prejudice, and to show that His death was in accordance with the counsels of God.

Christ, Trypho, the Jewish opponent of Justin Martyr although admitting the idea of a suffering Messiah, decidedly rejects the idea of a *Crucified* One (*Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 90). And he sums up his examination of the question of the 'suffering Messiah' by affirming that, on the whole, it was one quite foreign to Judaism in general, and by citing as an abundant proof of its repugnance to Jewish feeling the conduct of both the disciples and the opponents of Jesus[1] (Matt. xvi. 22; Luke xviii. 34, xxiv. 21; John xii. 34).

But if we are met, as seems to be the case, with this strange un-Jewish element in dealing with this and other great facts of our Lord's life, it is surely not too much to conclude that in many respects the Messiah of Judaism is, as Dr. Edersheim expressed it, the Anti-Christ of the Gospels, and, inasmuch as St. Paul preached 'Christ *crucified*, to the Jews a stumbling-block,' the Anti-Christ also of his Epistles.[2]

[1] Further mention is made of this circumstance in chap. v., and references will be found there to other authorities.

Schürer's words, to which reference is made above, are as follows: '*Der leidende Messias.* Aber so sehr sich von diesen Prämissen aus die Idee eines leidenden Messias auf dem Boden des Judenthums begreifen lässt, so wenig ist sie doch die herrschende Anschauung des Judenthums geworden. Das sozusagen officielle Targum Jonathan lässt zwar die Beziehung von *Jes.* 53 auf den Messias im Ganzen stehen, deutet aber gerade diejenigen Verse, welche vom Leiden des Knetches Gottes handeln, nicht auf den Messias. In keiner der zahlreichen von uns besprochenen Schriften fanden wir auch nur die leiseste Andeutung von einem sühnenden Leiden des Messias. Wie fern diese Idee dem Judenthum lag, beweist auch das Verhalten der Jünger wie der Gegner Jesu zu genüge (Matt. xvi. 22; Luc. xviii. 34, xxiv. 21; Joh. xii. 34.) Man wird nach alledem wohl sagen dürfen, dass sie dem Judenthum im ganzen und grossen fremd gewesen ist' (*Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii. pp. 464–466). Cf. also Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 111, 138. We may add to Schürer's remarks, as to the state of feeling of the disciples and the friends of Jesus, those of Dr. Dalman, and the passages in the New Testament quoted by him, in his important work *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*, pp. 30, 85, 86. 1888.

[2] See also Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 313 ff., and his criticism of Pfleiderer's account of Paul's position.

CHAPTER II

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT

PART I

IN the previous chapter an endeavour has been made to point out some common objections which the argument from the Pauline Epistles, as an historical basis for the life and teaching of our Lord, is calculated to meet.

But while many English writers have justly laid great stress upon this testimony of St. Paul, and while it has been increasingly felt that such evidence, derived from writings admitted to be genuine even by the most advanced critics, cuts at the very root of the famous mythical theory, it may not be without interest to show how various continental theologians have treated the same subject.

It may be said that in England the force of this connection between the Pauline Epistles and the Gospels has been more and more appreciated since the days of Dean Stanley's essay entitled 'The Epistles to the Corinthians in Relation to the Gospel History.' In this essay, which traces, chiefly from the two Epistles to the Corinthians, the resemblance between 'the Christ' of the Pauline Epistles and 'the Christ' of the Gospels, we see how such a resemblance constitutes 'a fifth Gospel,' and how correctly we may say of the Apostle who preached it that 'he becomes to us truly an "Evangelist."' [1]

It has, indeed, been thought that Dean Stanley somewhat undervalued the force of his own views; at all events, subsequent writers have pursued the same line of argument further, and its value may be increased by the extension of the same method to other Epistles.

In other well-known evidential works there are occasional

[1] Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 588.

chapters devoted to the same subject, and in books written with a much wider purpose no more could be expected ;[1] but they have no doubt powerfully contributed to keep before men's minds the importance of this line of argument, and references will accordingly be made to them in the following pages.

But when we turn from England to Germany, we shall no doubt be told, at the outset, that many German writers of note maintain that St. Paul hardly ever alludes to the human life and teaching of Jesus, and that they are hopelessly divided as to whether he ever saw Him.

We could not refer, as a starting-point, to a more interesting name than that of Karl Hase, whose death in 1890 deprived Germany of probably her most venerable and her most learned Church historian, and whose 'Leben Jesu,' published in 1829, six years before that of Strauss, had the distinction of being the first work of the kind. Hase is classed as a rationalist, but no one has pointed out more forcibly how unreasonable it is to ignore the Personality of the Founder of the Christian Church in any attempt to account for its origin ; no one has more scornfully put aside the preposterous theories which would question, with a Bruno Bauer, the very existence of Jesus of Nazareth, or which fail, with Strauss and his followers,

[1] Dr. Leathes, *Religion of the Christ* (Bampton Lectures, 1874), pp. 267–310; Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, pp. 251 ff., 4th edit., and *Christian Evidences in relation to Modern Thought*, pp. 330–357 (Bampton Lectures, 1877); Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 177 ff.; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 155–160; Kennedy, *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, pp. 247 ff. ; Plumptre in *Commentary on the N. T.* (Ellicott) i. pp. xxix, ff. Amongst recent writings expressly bearing upon this subject we may mention *Fragmentary Records of Jesus of Nazareth, from the Letters of a Contemporary* (Wynne [Hodder and Stoughton], 1887) ; and two of the valuable *Present Day Tracts*, one by Dean Howson, on *Evidential Conclusions from the Four greater Epistles of St. Paul*, and the other by the Genevan Professor F. Godet, on *The Authenticity of the Four principal Epistles of St. Paul*. Godet refers to the decisions of two or three advanced German critics in favour of the authenticity of the Epistles in question, whilst Professor Wynne quotes Renan's judgment, which Godet also introduces, as justifying an extension of the argument beyond these four Epistles. But it is much to be regretted that the very interesting and exhaustive papers, so far as the four chief Epistles are concerned, by Dr. Matheson, entitled *The Historical Christ of St. Paul*, have never appeared in a separate form. (See *Expositor*, vols. i. and ii. 2nd series, and comp. Footman's *Reasonable Apprehensions*, &c. pp. 85. ff.).

to recognise His unique creative power in a religion which has transformed the world.

If we only possessed, as Hase reminds us, the earliest records of Christianity (recognised as such by the Tübingen school), viz. the Apocalypse and the four great Pauline Epistles, 'the authenticity of which has never been doubted by one earnest man,'[1] and if we add to these the information given us by Tacitus of the Christian persecution under Nero, we are in possession of at least three historical facts, *quite apart from the four Gospels*: viz. that a Jew, Jesus of Nazareth, was crucified under Pontius Pilate in the days of Tiberius Cæsar; that he was called the Christ; and that he became the founder of a religious community, from which have proceeded a new principle of life, and a transformation of the history of the world.[2]

But when he passes from these broad general statements, it must be confessed that Hase finds little in the New Testament to complete our representation of Jesus, if we look for information beyond our Gospels. Paul, who is our oldest and safe witness, although not an eye-witness, or, at any rate, not one upon his own testimony; who became an Apostle, in Hase's view, in the short interval of three or four years after the Crucifixion; who had interviews with Apostles, and who stayed with Peter in Jerusalem; whose letters are the authentic

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 8, 9, 1876, and *Leben Jesu*, p. 1, 4. Aufl. 1854.

[2] 'Ein Jude, Jesus von Nasaret, genannt der Messias, der schmachvoll untergegangen ist, hat eine religiöse Gemeinschaft gegründet, von der ein neues Lebensprincip und eine Umgestaltung der Weltgeschichte ausgegangen ist . . . Dieses also steht fest: die mächtige religiöse Persönlichkeit des Gründers der Christenheit, sein tragischer Untergang und irgend ein Ereigniss der siegreichen Erhebung seiner Sache aus diesem Untergange' (*Geschichte Jesu*, p. 9).

Hase entirely repudiates any attempt to put Paul into the place of Jesus; from her earliest days the Christian Church had shown a moral religious energy, hitherto unheard of; when to all appearance she was only a poor conventicle, she had boldly proclaimed her belief that she was destined to become a universal religion, and she has become so; but all this energy, and this triumphant belief, was derived, with one consent, from her Founder, Jesus of Nazareth. To deny His existence, or, if that is really too absurd, to deny His creative genius, His moral grandeur, and His religious might, is to refer the whole transforming power of Christianity to chance causes, and one might as well affirm that Strasburg Cathedral had been constructed in a night, or in the course of a century, by the confluence of the dust of the streets (see pp. 8 and 9).

representation of the immeasureable impression which Jesus made upon all classes of His contemporaries, seems purposely to ignore all matters of detail in His earthly life (2 Cor. v. 16). Certainly, once in a way, the Apostle mentions His descent from David, the fact that He was 'made under the law,' and his decision with regard to the indissolubility of the marriage tie; on the occasion of the abuses which had gained ground in the Church at Corinth, he describes the institution of the holy Supper, but his pious memory moves only around the simple facts of the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, and the heavenly glorification of Christ.[1] 'And so,' concludes Hase, 'we can only appropriate in a limited way the favourite modern paradox, "The Epistles are also Gospels."' For the history of Jesus, the Epistles are of more value than the Gospels as authentic vouchers, but of much less as sources of our knowledge of details.[2]

But it will be noticed that, even with these limitations, Hase recognises in the four great Pauline Epistles 'sources of the first rank' for the life of Jesus, and an irrefutable testimony to the grandeur of His Personality, and to the earliest belief of the Christian Church. In this respect Hase occupies a very different standpoint from that of Strauss, who seems to have had no idea of the value of Paul's testimony, which, as Keim clearly saw, was fatal to the mythical theory as an adequate account of the Gospel narratives.[3]

It was, moreover, to the interest of Baur and the Tübingen

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 9, 10.

[2] 'Daher wir uns die neuerlich beliebte Paradoxie: "auch die Episteln sind Evangelien," nur in beschränkter Weise aneignen können. An urkundlicher Sicherheit bedeuten die paulinischen Briefe für die Geschichte Jesu noch mehr als die Evangelien, an individuellem Inhalt viel weniger' (p. 10). Comp. Hase's *Leben Jesu*, p, 1, 4. Aufl. '*Quellen ersten Ranges* . . . Daher sind unmittelbare Quellen die vier Evangelien; mittelbare Quellen die paulinischen Briefe, weniger durch Hindeutungen auf Aussprüche und Schicksale Jesu, als durch die urkundliche Darstellung des ersten Eindrucks, den sein Leben gemacht hat.'

[3] In Hase's *Kirchengeschichte* (Vorlesungen), erster Theil, p. 140, 1885, after referring to Baur's acceptance of only four of Paul's Epistles, he adds that he himself accepts as equally certain 1 Thess. and Philemon; Colossians and Philippians are contested, he thinks, chiefly owing to the prejudice that Paul did not ascribe a superhuman nature to Christ, but, as he adds, only an artificial interpretation can extinguish the high Christology in the Corinthian Epistles.

school to minimise, for more reasons than one, St. Paul's knowledge of the *historical* Christ. Their object was to emphasise to the utmost the supposed opposition between Paul and the Twelve, upon which supposition their whole theory depended, and they therefore represented Paul as if he disdained all knowledge of the historical Christ as a knowledge according to the flesh, and they described his Gospel as a pure idealism.[1]

The less Paul knew of the historical Jesus the more dogmatic (as Paret points out) the position which he could take up with regard to Him. The space which in the case of the other Apostles was filled up by memory, begetting as it were second-sight, was in the case of Paul quite empty, or at least half-empty. Upon this *tabula rasa* he could express his Christological ideas. In this space, the more empty it was, the more easily could theological dogmas, as, *e.g.*, that of the pre-existence of Christ, and all that was connected with it, settle—dogmas which were neither begotten from intuition, nor communicated by its means but which took an independent flight into the air at random.[2]

But although Baur himself represents St. Paul as viewing Christ's whole human life only in the light of His death, that death upon the cross being the great turning-point where for the Apostle, and for all who were truly 'in Christ,' all things became new, and although the original Apostles could thus no longer claim precedence on the ground of their direct intercourse with their Master,[3] yet it ought not to be forgotten that Baur by no means affirms that Paul was ignorant of the facts of the Gospels; we learn not only incidentally, but from the plainest statements, that he recognises St. Paul's acquaintance with the chief contents of the Gospel history.[4] No sooner did it please God to reveal His Son in him, that he

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 53. On this opposition and recent criticism see further in chap. iii. [2] Paret, *ubi supra*, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 7.

[3] Baur, *Paulus*, i. 304, 305.

Paret points out (p. 24) that Baur is no doubt quite correct in maintaining that St. Paul regards the earthly life of Jesus entirely in the light of His death, but that the same view is expressed in each of the first three Gospels in words uttered by Jesus Himself.

[4] See Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 19.

might preach Him among the heathen, than a new world opened to the Apostle's consciousness ; but whilst his own strong individuality preserved him from ever becoming a dependent upon others, and whilst he based his whole work and Apostleship upon the direct call of God, he certainly did not cease from making inquiries into the historical life of Jesus, and a man who could speak so positively, and in such detail, as the Apostle does in 1 Cor. xi. 23, and xv. 8, of the facts of the Gospel history could not have been unacquainted with the chief contents of the same.[1]

In the hands of Baur's immediate follower, A. Schwegler, his views, as Pfleiderer candidly admits,[2] were exaggerated into a caricature: before Paul, Christianity was simply a narrow ascetic form of Judaism, and the only question with which it had any concern was whether Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah. With this narrow Jewish Christianity traces of Ebionitish views were united at a much earlier date than is usually supposed to have been the case, as we see from the manner in which Hegesippus represents 'James, the brother of the Lord,' a description in which Schwegler places unhesitating confidence.

Opposed to this Jewish Christianity stands Pauline Christianity, with its two leading ideas of the abrogation of the Mosaic law, and the universality of the Christian religion, or, in other words, justification by faith instead of the righteousness of the law, and the reception of the Gentiles without circumcision.[3] This opposition it is usual to regard as the

[1] Baur, *Paulus*, i. 103. 'Wer von Thatsachen der evangelischen Geschichte so bestimmt und so speciell reden kann, wie der Apostel thut (1 Cor. ii. 23 f., 15, 8 f.) kann auch mit dem übrigen Hauptinhalt derselben nicht unbekannt gewesen sein.'

We may compare with the above, *Paulus*, ii. pp. 196, 197, and also p. 267, where Baur interprets 2 Cor. 8, 9 of earthly poverty, thus intimating that St. Paul was acquainted with the facts of the Saviour's humble life. It is to be noted that Strauss not only ignores the testimony of the Pauline Epistles, but that he seems less disposed than Baur to admit the likelihood of Paul's acquaintance with the facts of the life of Jesus (*Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. pp. 66, 368, 5th edit.)

[2] *Development of Theology*, p. 233, 1890.

[3] *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptpunkten seiner Entwickelung*, i. 23-25.

inspiring motive of Church development during the Apostolic age, and as overcome by Paul himself. But in Schwegler's opinion there is not a single fact which testifies to the accuracy of this belief in the victory of Pauline Christianity during the Apostolic age; both the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles testify to the opposite. The truth, as Schwegler maintains, is that the same conflict which prevailed in early days marked also the succeeding period, and the task of the historian is to follow the struggle step by step until ecclesiastical Christianity, *i.e.* a Christianity of a more or less Ebionitic Jewish type, developed into Catholicism. Prior to this stage it cannot be said that Pauline Christianity, or the principles of the Pauline teaching, had gained any real ascendency.[1] But theories are not facts, and 'it seems,' writes Pfleiderer, 'as if Schwegler, hypnotised as it were with the one idea of early Christian "Ebionitism," was completely blind to all the varied thoughts and interests which moved that age and also influenced the life and belief of the Christian Churches.' 'The dangerous tendency,' he adds, 'to be seen, it must be confessed, in Baur, of insisting too exclusively on a new point of view as the only true one, was carried in Schwegler to the most extreme lengths.'[2]

What, we naturally ask, were the sources from which Schwegler derived his views? The earlier the date, he argues, the rarer becomes our acquaintance with written authorities, and the more exclusive our dependence on oral tradition. If even amongst the learned classes of the Jews literary activity was so slight, much more was this the case amongst the primitive Apostles and the early Christians. In Schwegler's opinion, as in that of his master, F. C. Baur, only five written documents remain to us which can with certainty be ascribed to the Apostolic age, viz. Gal., Rom., 1. and 2 Cor. and the Apocalypse; the Acts is a mere 'tendency' writing, which must be left quite out of the question.[3] Primitive Christianity was the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ: the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts

[1] *Ubi supra*, pp. 23–29, and ff. [2] *Ubi supra*, p. 233.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 89, 90.

are at one in this, that the announcement of the Christ who had been crucified and raised again, formed the whole contents of the Apostolic message.[1]

Thus Christianity was in its origin only a question internal to Judaism, and a step in the development of it: in its earliest days its followers were reckoned as a mere Jewish sect (Acts xxiv. 5, xxviii. 22), and its teaching as a continuation of Old Testament Judaism, and the final stage of it: Christ Himself was placed on a level with the Old Testament prophets, and the Christology of the earliest days of the Church did not consist in elaborating His divine nature—the Jewish Messiahship was the measure of His dignity.[2] Primitive Christianity, therefore, knows nothing of a metaphysical conception of Christ's Person: on the contrary, it was Ebionitish;[3] and that was the conception which prevailed until ecclesiastical Christianity separated from it, and Irenæus classed the Ebionites as heretics. Up to that date ecclesiastical Christianity was, to repeat Schwegler's favourite mode of expression, more or less Ebionitish, *i.e.* Jewish, and although the sharp Judaism which Paul had to face in the Galatian Epistle did not prevail for any length of time after the Apostolic age, yet throughout the whole subsequent period Judaism only declined step by step, and Catholicism only gradually took its place.[4] If, then, Christianity had been represented by the primitive Apostles alone, its followers would have remained a mere Jewish sect, which in the course of time would have been absorbed again by the ancient Jewish religion, or it would have gained the upper hand of Judaism, but only to the extent that the Messiahship of Jesus would have been acknowledged as a Jewish dogma. But it would never have overrun the world and gained recognition as the universal religion. To whom did Christianity owe this freedom from Judaism, and its independence alike in essence and principle? Schwegler answers: To the Apostle Paul.[5] At the head of the Pauline system stands the idea upon which its historical significance really rests, viz. the idea of the newness and in-

[1] *Ubi supra*, p. 91. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 99-101. [3] *Ibid.* 102, 103.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 107. [5] *Ibid.* p. 148.

dependence of Christianity, it was a καινὴ κτίσις, a new creation, a principle new and distinct from Judaism : to this principle Paul's two fundamental practical thoughts were directly united, viz. the abrogation of the Mosaic law, and the universality of the Messianic salvation—the former a consequence of the new life of Christianity in its relation to the Jew, the latter in relation to the Gentile.[1] Closely connected with these thoughts was Paul's teaching as to the universal sinfulness of the human race, on account of which both Jew and Gentile alike lay under a curse. In Christianity, therefore, Paul saw a redemptive power, and the principle of a new birth : the teaching and example of Christ retire into the background when set against His atoning death, and as the Christian himself is no longer a mere Jew, but a καινὴ κτίσις, so Christ is no longer regarded as the last of the prophets, but as 'the second Adam.'[2] But if we inquire as to Paul's relation to historical Christianity,[3] we find that in Schwegler's opinion the Apostle is absolutely silent as to the Gospel history : as an historical personage Christ does not occupy the prominent position which one would expect ; no mention is made of His deeds and miracles ; these all disappear before the miracle of His resurrection ; no facts or incidents of His life are introduced with the exception of His death and the institution of the Last Supper ; there is no mention of Christ's teaching, and passages such as 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, admit of another reference.[4] Paul, according to him, positively disdains any obligation to the tradition of the life and history of Jesus ; he received his gospel not by means of others or by human instruction, and plainly for him historical Christianity consisted in nothing else but the simple facts of the appearance of the Messiah, of His death, of His resurrection.

But though Schwegler fails to see how much is involved in the proposition *Jesus is the Christ*,[5] which he himself emphasises as the sum and substance of the Apostolic

[1] *Ubi supra*, p. 152. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 152–154. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 154, 155.

[4] This is all Schwegler has to say of such passages in the brief note contained on p. 155.

[5] See below, chap. v.

preaching; though he fails to do justice to the historical notices scattered throughout the Pauline and other Epistles of the New Testament, which later writers, like Keim and Hausrath, have so fully recognised,[1] yet in a remarkable note he admits that the spiritualisation and transfiguration of the Jewish Messianic conception must in any case be referred back to Christ Himself, although it may be almost impossible to make a full and accurate representation of His Personality.[2] Thus, Schwegler, like others before and after him, is constrained to recognise in the Personality of Jesus a character and a power which he cannot dismiss from his account of Christianity in its relation to Judaism, and the real answer to the question which he asks above, is, not Paul, but Jesus. No one has pointed out the weakness in Schwegler's position more strikingly than Albrecht Ritschl ('Die Entstehung der Altkatholischen Kirche,' 1857, p. 19), and he truly remarks that Schwegler leaves to his readers the unpleasant task of deciding which was the real Christ—Paul or Jesus. Although Ritschl is not concerned to discuss the precise knowledge of the historical Jesus which Paul might or might not have possessed, since he is chiefly occupied with the consideration of the results of the death and resurrection of Christ upon the believer (pp. 79, 81, 84, 89 ff.), it is evident that in his view (in contrast with that of Schwegler) the Apostle must have had considerable acquaintance with the sayings and discourses of Jesus (pp. 49, 58, 102, comp. 330), and that he could not have been without some definite information as to the marvellous impression which the human life of the Saviour must have produced; how otherwise could he have insisted so pointedly upon the sinlessness of Jesus (p. 85)? Indeed, this information would seem naturally to be presupposed in the stress which Ritschl (while careful to guard Paul's originality [p. 52]) lays upon the fact that both Paul and the other Apostles had access to a common history, and that there was no fundamental opposition between them, but rather an agreement which extended even to the dogmatic conception of Christ's Person, and to a recognition of the absoluteness

[1] See further in this chapter, pp. 44 ff.

[2] *Ubi supra*, pp. 148, note.

of the revelation made in Him (pp. 23, 48, 51, 88, 120, 121).

It is worth noting that Schwegler helps us to realise what a tremendous shock the death of Jesus as a malefactor was to the early Christians. He lays great stress upon the manner in which the Epistles of the New Testament, and Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho,' reveal what a stumbling-block the cross must have been, and continued to be.[1] He argues, indeed, that the Christians of Apostolic days, finding themselves robbed of their Jewish Messianic hopes, of the advent of Jesus in the clouds of heaven to restore the kingdom to Israel, had no resource but to transfer to the future what the present denied them, and to postpone their Messianic hopes to a second advent of the Christ for their completion: hence the expectation of the *Parousia* so prominent in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Epistles alike.[2]

But the more Schwegler emphasises 'the offence of the cross' the more difficult is it to understand how the hopes which died with Jesus on Calvary could have been revived, unless another fact is presupposed—the Resurrection of the crucified Messiah.

Amongst the foremost opponents of the Tübingen school stood Heinrich Ewald, to whom reference has already been made in Chapter I. In Ewald's opinion the oldest written Gospel, a Gospel with which the Apostle Paul was acquainted, may with more probability be attributed to Philip the Evangelist, the first person who meets us in Church history as definitely called by that name (Acts xxi. 8), and who stands next in the list to Stephen in Acts vi. 5, amongst the seven men of honest report. No one, as Ewald thinks, would have been more likely, or more fitted, as an Hellenist, to compose this first written Gospel.[3] Ewald of course admits that his view must remain a conjecture, but he maintains that

[1] See above, chap. i. p. 23, and further in chap. vi. [2] *Ubi supra* p. 108–110.

[3] *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 48, 63, 2. Aufl. 1871. Comp., however, Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 483, and Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396. On Ewald's view of the relation of the *Spruchsammlungen* or Collection of the Sayings of Jesus, which he also recognises, see Weiss, *ubi supra*, and Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 63–71.

it is not without foundation, and that nothing forbids its acceptance, and his remarks may still be read with interest on the work of the Evangelists, and their relation to Luke's statement in the Prologue of his Gospel.[1]

At the same time Ewald distinctly recognises the part played by oral tradition. Such passages as 1 Cor. vii. 6, 10, 11, 25, 40, ix. 14, xi. 23, xv. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 6, iv. 15, only prove that appeal was not made to a written document in questions relating to the words and acts of Christ, because a man like Paul still stood sufficiently near to the original source of the reminiscences of the Saviour's life and teaching, and because what had been perhaps already written down comprised only a small part of the whole of the traditions; but all this by no means proves that there was no written Gospel in existence at that early date,[2] and Ewald has no doubt that the manner in which Paul expresses himself in 1 Thess. v. i. points to the fact that his readers had before them a written report of Christ's words.[3] 'The notion that when Paul refers to something which has come down from Christ, he refers only to his own visions is so absolutely groundless and unjust that I have never considered it worthy of a refutation. On the contrary, it may be seen that he had often before him a Gospel in cases where he does not appeal to a tradition from Christ (see *Sendschreiben*, p. 48, and elsewhere).'[4] This oldest written Gospel always remained at the Apostle's command: it is the use of it by Luke and Paul alike which accounts for their close relationship in the important words at the Last Supper (Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 23–25).[5]

Ewald, moreover, recognises the fact that Paul after his

[1] Some interesting remarks upon the work of the Catechists and their method of teaching, and the value attached by St. Paul to their labours, and the high rank assigned to them in the early Church will be found in Mr. Wright's *Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890 (Macmillan).

[2] Ewald, *ibid.* pp. 62, 63; comp. also *History of Israel*, vii. 289, E. T.

[3] Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 48, 1857. See below, chap. viii.

[4] Ewald, *History of Israel*, vii. 290, note, E.T.

[5] Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 63, 427. Comp., however, Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396.

conversion would naturally take care to inform himself of the incidents connected with the earthly life of Jesus, for, although he holds that the Apostle had probably seen Christ in the flesh, yet he could not, like the other Apostles who had actually lived with Christ, recall to mind with equal vividness the Saviour's words and deeds, or appeal to them with equal decisiveness as precedents and models; the instructions of Ananias before or after his baptism, his intercourse with other Christians in Damascus and its neighbourhood, would have supplied this defect to some extent, but more especially Paul's visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, in which Ewald sees the Apostle's purpose to gain information from Peter as to the historical events of the life of Jesus. But whilst Ewald thus fully admits Paul's knowledge of the Gospel history and teaching, he considers it as a mark of the Apostle's great simplicity and sincerity that he left it to others better qualified, to a Peter or a John, to point in detail to the example of the historical Christ, and he holds that for the same reason the Apostle intentionally avoids all reference to that example in his own Epistles.[1]

The name of another of Baur's opponents is more popularly known in England than that of Ewald, the name of the great historian and theologian, Augustus Neander—the man who counselled calm and patient reasoning when the whole continent of Europe was thrown into alarm by Strauss's 'Leben Jesu,' and when the Prussian Government was eager for the suppression of the book.[2]

Neander, like Ewald, held that Paul had access to a written Gospel, or rather Gospels, whilst he fully recognises the independence of Paul's character, and accepts unhesitatingly the

[1] Ewald, *History of Israel*, vii. 278, 279, 283, 288, 289, 294, E. T.

On p. 294, note, Ewald expresses his opinion that it is not accidental that such references to Christ's earthly life as in 1 Pet. ii. 21 ff., iii. 18 ff., 1 John i. 1, never occur in Paul's Epistles. 'We perceive also from this that such Epistles as those of John and the first of Peter, although other indications show that they must be traced to the Apostles themselves, must all the more certainly be regarded as proceeding from them.'

References to Ewald's *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus* will be found in other chapters.

[2] Dr. A. S. Farrar's *Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 383.

Apostle's statement that he had received his Gospel, not from man, but only by the Spirit of Christ. But he also holds that this by no means involves the belief that the Apostle received his information as to the life and discourses of Jesus by supernatural communication. It is quite unnatural, he thinks, to suppose that Christ must have communicated to the Apostle by means of special visions all that He had said and done on earth ;[1] and where Paul himself introduces words or ordinances of Christ, he speaks in such a manner as to cause us to think of no other source of information than that of ordinary human tradition : thus, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. xi. 23, he uses *ἀπό*, not *παρά*, to signify that what he had 'received' was not *immediately* but *mediately* from the Lord : had Paul been speaking of a special revelation by which this information had been communicated to him, he would not, Neander thinks, have employed the expression *παρέλαβον* but rather *ἀπεκαλύφθη*.[2] Nor can we suppose, that Paul, as he felt himself compelled to examine independently the depths of the truth proclaimed by Christ, would have satisfied himself with isolated expressions of the Saviour casually derived from oral intercourse with the Apostles, with whom he came into contact so seldom and so briefly ; we are led to the supposition that he procured written memoirs of the life of Christ, or at least a written collection of the sayings of Christ, if any such existed, or that he compiled one for himself.[3] It is very probable, in Neander's opinion, that such a written collection, or several such were in existence, and also written memoirs of Christ's ministry, for we must not forget that we are speaking of an age in which literary activity prevailed, however highly we may value the power of the living word in these days of the Church's youth. That which moved men's hearts so deeply and occupied them so fully would surely have been soon committed to written memoirs, although not until after an interval might anyone resolve to write a Life of Christ as a whole. In confirmation of his view, Neander refers to the

[1] *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, &c., i. 154, 5. Aufl. ; see also *Life of Christ*, p. 7, E.T.

[2] *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, &c., p. 155, 5. Aufl. See chap. ix.

[3] *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, pp. 155, 156.

many reminiscences of Christ's expressions which meet us in the Pauline Epistles, besides the Apostle's direct quotations of Christ's words, all of which point to the existence of some collection of the sayings of Jesus, of which Paul availed himself.[1] Nor is it without significance that in the fourth edition of his work, which contains the additions and corrections of the author, Neander further expresses his conviction that when Paul in his Epistles speaks of the imitation of Christ he speaks in a manner which presupposes that a definite historical image of the Saviour was known throughout the whole Church, and taking everything together, we are justified in the supposition that Paul employed some original historical record of Christ's ministry as a point of connection for his instruction, and that this shorter record fell into oblivion when our fuller Gospels had incorporated its contents and attained to more general acceptance.[2]

In the following chapters many references to Neander's works will be found, and although in the recent (1890) reprint of the fifth edition (1862) of the 'Geschichte der Pflanzung' in the 'Bibliothek theologischer Klassiker' the polemical remarks directed against the Tübingen school are for the most part omitted, yet Neander's weighty examination of Paul's character and of the incidents of his conversion,[3] as well as of the many points of connection between his teaching and that of Christ, is by no means to be dismissed as out of date. Both Neander and Ewald furnish us with a protest, the force of which cannot be ignored, against the views which would reduce the Apostle Paul to the level of a mere enthusiast and fanatic, evolving out of his own brain the picture of a Christ whom he had not only never seen, but of whose life and teaching he possessed no accurate information whatever.

If we turn to a writer who has been described as the most acute and learned of Baur's followers, Carl Holsten, we find that he gives us a modified view of the relationship

[1] *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, pp. 156, 157.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 157. The words are retained in the fifth edit. Neander's *Additions and Corrections* are also given in the English trans. of the fourth edit. of the *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles*, ii. pp. 58–190.

[3] *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, pp. 118 ff.

between Paul and the Twelve, inasmuch as he grants that both the Petrine and the Pauline gospels were based upon the preaching and life of Jesus, and that the bitter opposition of Peter against Paul did not develop itself until after the conflict at Antioch.[1] But he still insists that Paul's gaze is directed only towards the Saviour's death and resurrection, although he admits that in these two facts is included a knowledge of their attendant circumstances, such, *e.g.*, as is revealed in the Apostle's acquaintance with the words of Jesus at the Last Supper.[2] All that Paul may have learnt from Peter during his fourteen days visit to Jerusalem[3] occupies only the background in his religious consciousness and therefore in the oral tradition which he delivered to the Churches which he founded: the only source of information for the historical life of Jesus flowed, not in the Pauline tradition, but in that derived from the primitive Apostles.[4] But in the gospel of a Peter, the gospel of the Circumcision, there was no assertion, as in the Pauline gospel, of a new principle of life in Jesus, of a perfect freedom from the righteousness of the law, no recognition that the death of Jesus on the cross was the death of Judaism itself.[5] Holsten, however, quite admits that while the gospel of Peter differed from that of Paul, in that the former, cramped and confined by a Jewish legalism, was destitute of the living power of the latter, yet the spirit of Jesus lived in each;[6] and it may well have been that Paul in his intercourse with Peter received a picture of the personality and preaching of Jesus which convinced him that the gospel to the heathen, revealed to him in the solitudes of Arabia, was in entire agreement with the spirit and doctrine of the Christ whom the primitive Apostles had known in the flesh, although such a picture was

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 14 and 141, 2. Aufl; Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, pp. 8–11, 84 ff.; Holsten, *Die synoptischen Evangelien nach der Form ihres Inhaltes*, pp. 2, 3, 1885. For Beyschlag's criticism on Holsten's Vision-Hypothesis see below, chap. vii.

[2] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 159.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 159, 172.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 159, 160.

[5] *Ibid.* pp. 162, 164; *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 312.

[6] *Ubi supra*, p. 164.

afterwards marred and spoilt by the wickedness of the Judaisers and their passionate dislike of Paul.[1]

Adolph Hilgenfeld would probably be named as the most prominent and assiduous of Baur's living disciples. As one of the most zealous defenders of the *Hauptbriefe* against Steck and Völter, frequent allusions will be found in Chap. III. to his recent articles in his 'Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie,'[2] and reference has already been made in Chap. I. to his acceptance of Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, and Romans xv. xvi. By accepting these writings and the tradition respecting the end of Peter as genuine, as also by moderating the contrast between Paulinism and primitive Apostolic Jewish Christianity, Hilgenfeld, as B. Weiss puts it, sought to cut away the most prominent excrescences of the Tübingen criticism.[3]

With regard to Paul's knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus, Hilgenfeld declines to draw any conclusion in favour of it from 2 Cor. v. 16. 'To know Christ after the flesh' is a knowledge which belongs only to the Apostle's Jewish opponents: there had been a time, before his conversion, when Paul himself had been open to a like imputation, when, *i.e.*, he had seen in the ignominious death of the cross a divine condemnation, and in that belief had persecuted the Christ

[1] *Ubi supra* pp. 165 ff.; *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, pp. 7, 8. Holsten's view of the relation between Paul and the first three canonical Gospels depends entirely upon what he calls the development of the dogmatic-religious consciousness by which the contradictory elements of Judaism and heathenism were gradually reconciled. Under this law of development our Gospels were written: Matthew, the Petrine Gospel; Mark, that of Paul, to show that the spirit and teaching of the historical Jesus lived in the spirit and teaching of Paul; Luke, the work of a unionist Pauline, the blending together and, at the same time, a remodelling of the two earlier Gospels. But not only is the order of the Gospels which Holsten advocates very different from that demanded by more recent criticism (see the remarks of Pfleiderer in *Development of Theology*, p. 240), but his view of their relationship to Paul is dominated by his desire to bring the life of the early Christian Church into submission to the law of an inward necessary development quite as arbitrary as that demanded by Baur or Schwegler. (Holsten, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 160, 170 ff.; comp. Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 482, 2. Aufl.)

[2] *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* pp. 485 ff. 1889, and *ibid.* pp. 357–61, 1890.

[3] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 14, 2. Aufl. 1889.

who had so falsified the Jewish ideas of a Messiah.[1] But all this was changed when God had revealed His Son in the Apostle (Gal. i. 16), and when Paul recognised the higher spiritual being of Jesus (Rom. i. 4). The aim of this revelation to Paul was essentially this: that he might preach the Son of God among the Gentiles, and that as the Apostle of the Gentiles he might avoid from the outset any dependence upon the primitive Apostles.[2] But whilst Paul thus stood distinguished from the Twelve as the Apostle of the Gentiles, Hilgenfeld emphasises the fact that even before Paul passed over to the Christian ranks the Christian communities had taken the important step of recognising Jesus as the Messiah in spite of His shameful death (a fact which still remained a cause of offence to the Jews: Gal. i. 11; 1 Cor. i. 23), and that to that belief they had adhered: the full consequences of the death of Jesus Paul was the first to perceive, but we must not overlook the connection between the earliest Christianity and that of Paul, which the recognition of that fact, viz. the death on the cross, most certainly involved.[3] Indeed, Paul's fundamental topic of Jesus as the Crucified, in which his whole preaching was comprehended, and his teaching as to the Saviour's atoning death, by which the righteousness which is by faith takes the place of the righteousness of the law, has its roots—as Hilgenfeld carefully reminds us—in the simple teaching of Jesus. If Paul, *e.g.*, regarded the death of Christ as the end of the law (Rom. x. 4), the Christ of Matthew had already declared his conviction (Matt. xi. 13) that with John the Baptist the prophecy of the law had ended and the time of fulfilment had commenced: if Jesus had connected the entrance into the kingdom of heaven with a return to the innocence of childhood (Matt. xviii. 3, xix. 14), and had represented greatness in that kingdom as a childlike humility, and the new relationship to God as that of a child

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 219; *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* p. 184 ff. 1864.

[2] *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* pp. 106, 223, 1860. Hilgenfeld, like the earlier members of the Tübingen school, insists upon the superiority of Galatians to the Acts (*ibid.* pp. 111 ff.; comp. *ibid.* pp. 1 ff. 1888).

[3] *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* pp. 108, 109, 1860.

to its heavenly Father, we have already that lowly submission and trust which meets us in Paul as the faith which justifies, which contains in itself a consciousness of the divine favour, and constitutes the very opposite of the righteousness of the Jew resting on the works of the law.[1]

But, whilst Hilgenfeld denies that the word *ἱστορῆσαι* in Gal. i. 18 means to inquire of Peter, instead of simply to make his acquaintance,[2] and whilst, like the Tübingen school in general, he makes Paul's belief and preaching centre around the two great facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus, he allows that Paul was quite sure of his fundamental agreement with the primitive Apostles as to the main facts of the Christian Creed (in proof of which he refers to the verse so often quoted by Christian apologists as to the harmony existing between Paul and the Twelve, 1 Cor. xv. 11), and that his information as to the appearances of the Risen Christ was received, not indeed from Peter, but from the current Christian tradition (1 Cor. xv. 3, *παρέλαβον*).[3] If, however, Hilgenfeld thus acknowledges Paul's debt to his fellow-Christians for this information, is it not a very difficult matter to determine how much more the Apostle may not have received from similar sources; especially when Hilgenfeld, in a recent article, certainly appears to endorse Weizsäcker's view, that Paul, in his visit to Peter (Gal. i. 18), received communications from him both as to the life and as to the teaching of Jesus?[4]

But, whilst we cannot cite Hilgenfeld as bearing witness in detail to the fulness of Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ,[5] we are able to attach special importance to his weighty defence of the *Hauptbriefe*, and to the uncompromising attitude which he assumes towards Steck and similar

[1] *Ubi supra*, pp. 109–11. [2] *Ibid.* p. 96, 1864. See below, chap. vii.

[3] *Ibid.* pp. 96, 97. Hilgenfeld, it will be noted, dwells upon the expression, *the third day* (1 Cor. xv. 4), as being derived from the oldest testimony, and also upon the remarkable agreement between 1 Cor. xv. 7 and the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.

[4] *Ibid.* pp. 9, 10, 1888; comp. Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 83.

[5] Hilgenfeld, it is worthy of notice, admits that such passages as Gal. iv. 4, 1 Cor. x. 4, and 2 Cor. viii. 9 prove that Paul ascribes to Christ a personal pre-existence, although he denies that there was anything special in Christ's birth to mark Him out from other men (*Zeitschrift für wissen. Theol.* pp. 188–90, 1871).

opponents of the four great Pauline Epistles, expressing, as it does, the judgment of the foremost living representative of Baur's followers.

But if we pass from those who are followers of Baur, in the stricter sense, to the representatives of the modern critical school, we shall find that while for the most part they limit St. Paul's preaching to the simple announcement of the Crucified and Risen Christ, they often recognise in a remarkable manner his acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, the fulness of this acquaintance being sometimes rather implied than illustrated in detail.

Thus Schenkel states, as an undoubted fact, that Paul during his first visit to Jerusalem must have learnt many incidents of the life and work of Jesus more especially from a most trustworthy eye-witness, St. Peter (Gal. i. 18),[1] although these communications were not regarded by the Apostle as the essential contents of his message of salvation, for that was summed up in the brief statement that in Jesus of Nazareth the Christ had certainly appeared, and that Jesus as the Christ had suffered on the cross for the sins of men, and had risen from the dead to awaken them to a new life. Schenkel quotes, amongst matters of detail, St. Paul's references to the descent and birth of Jesus ; he is of opinion that the appearances of the Risen Christ to Peter, the Twelve Apostles, the five hundred brethren, James, the whole body of Apostles (in the wider meaning of the word) could only have been communicated to St. Paul by eye-witnesses or their friends ; that St. Paul undoubtedly learnt from an Apostle's mouth the teaching of Jesus concerning divorce.[2] The exact description which St. Paul gives of the institution of the Lord's Supper is the result of information which he had received, not indeed from written sources, but from the communication of one who had actually shared in the first celebration. To these statements, moreover, we must add such incidental allusions to the Gospel history as Schenkel finds

[1] *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, p. 59 : 'Ohne Zweifel hat Paulus aus dem Leben und Wirken Jesu damals manche Einzelheiten, zumal von Petrus als dem zuverlässigsten Augenzeugen, erfahren.' [2] *Ibid.* p. 60.

in Col. ii. 11,[1] and the admission of the testimony, not only of the Pauline Epistles, but of the first Epistle of St. Peter to the facts of the Passion of Jesus.[2]

It will also be noticed that although Schenkel is not inclined to admit St. Paul's personal acquaintance with Jesus, nor to draw any such inference from 2 Cor. v. 16, he recognises that from the first days of the Christian Church in Jerusalem, the Apostle's attention appears to have been directed to the Person of Jesus: as Saul, the zealous Pharisee, he inquired into the circumstances of His life and ministry, fixed a keen eye upon the Twelve and their work, and gained information of those appearances of the Risen Christ in which His disciples made their boast.[3]

But it is when we turn to the writer who is sometimes described as the greatest of negative critics, Theodor Keim, that we find St. Paul's testimony to the narrative of the Gospels most keenly examined and valued. In treating of the New Testament sources, Keim remarks at the outset that in order to gain a firm footing we are obliged in the present day to start, not with the Gospels, but with the earlier and less doubtful Pauline Epistles, since we possess no earlier witness than the Apostle Paul.[4]

At first sight it might seem as if even Keim did not attach such great importance to this testimony, since, although he maintains the opinion that St. Paul was acquainted with the earthly Jesus, he proceeds at once to point out that the Apostle's change of religion was rather due to the inner revelation which God made to him of His Son, and that his belief ever derived encouragement from inner more than from external facts. Paul's whole Christianity differed, therefore, from that of the other Apostles, inasmuch as it consisted of a world of ideas constructed upon faith in a Messiah whose advent was past, and who had revealed himself in glory, rather than of a faithful recollection of the words and works of the historical Jesus; very seldom does Paul give

[1] *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, p. 285.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 50, 51.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 55, 56.
[4] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. 35.

us literally the sayings and deeds of his Master, whilst he so transforms facts into ideas and ideas into facts that his testimony has decreased in weight, and of late the arguments from the Pauline writings have been met by the more subtle critics with the objection that in such arguments chips of thought are translated into facts, and stones into bread.[1] 'But,' adds Keim, 'in all this there is a great deal of exaggeration. Paul was not indifferent to historical facts.'

After suggesting some of the various sources of information open to the Apostle, and pointing out that his journey to Jerusalem to see Peter was expressly undertaken with the object of learning from him the details of his intercourse with Jesus, he proceeds: 'It is, however, quite sufficient to know what his Epistles show to us. In them value is assigned to Christian tradition, and from them it does not at all appear that Paul was contented with the general facts of the crucifixion, the burial, and the resurrection.' In proof of this Keim connects 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 14; Rom. xii. 14; 1 Thess. v. 2, with the sayings and injunctions of Jesus, and expresses his belief that Paul's moral and fundamental conception of the kingdom of God could not have been acquired without some precise knowledge of the teaching of Jesus.[2] . . . Upon the most decisive points of Christian doctrine, in the question as to the meaning of the death of Jesus, and the reality of His resurrection, he maintains that Paul has given such trusty historical information, and thorough historical proofs, that his communications are of equal value with the Gospel histories, and surpass the earliest conceptions of the Apostolic Age concerning the death of Jesus; and that we are therefore fully justified in maintaining that the life of Jesus was far more richly at his command than we can now determine, because, in his Epistles, he always presupposes that the elements of tradition, and the delineation of the figure of Christ, are before the eyes of his hearers. But when Keim reminds us that we owe it to an incidental circumstance—the disorders at the Corinthian love-feasts—that a picture of the historical Supper of Jesus

[1] *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. 35, 36. [2] *Ibid.* i. 36, 37.

is revealed to us, a picture which manifests the most perfect harmony between the purpose of Jesus and the Apostle's preaching of the cross; and that we owe it to an incidental circumstance—the doubts of Corinth relating to marriage—that the Apostle's acquaintance with the moral world of Jesus is disclosed beyond all doubt; we may reasonably argue that if Paul could thus bring to bear upon mere passing and incidental circumstances the life and teaching of the Saviour, a very wide and comprehensive knowledge of that life and teaching must have been at his command.[1]

'But is it indeed really true,' asks Keim, 'that facts and ideas are quite inseparably intermingled by Paul? It must be granted, that the pre-existence of the Messiah, his Incarnation, the aim of his death . . . are as much matters of fact to the Apostle as the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus. . . . But when, quite apart from this strange mingling of pre-temporal and post-temporal history, the Apostle makes a number of statements concerning the temporal life of Jesus, and represents them in a purely matter-of-fact way, without any far-reaching and set motive, shall we then complain of a mixture of facts and ideas; and can one suppose that the Apostle has given a dogmatic colouring to facts in a province in which only the actual fact could have any significance to himself and others, and admitted of the fullest verification by friend and foe?'[2]

'What, then,' Keim next proceeds to inquire, 'did Paul know of the life of Jesus?' That He was a man born, like ourselves, of a woman; that He was an Israelite, belonging in particular to the house of David; that from His birth he grew up under the Law; that though poor in the world, He was in truth the Christ, yea, the Son of God, for the good of mankind (compare Gal. iv. 4; Rom. i. 3, 4, v. 12 ff., ix. 5; 2 Cor. viii. 9). Strong in the spirit, weak in the flesh, which was like our own, He neither knew nor did sin; He entirely fulfilled God's demand for righteousness, as no one had ever fulfilled it; he served Israel in love, selected Apostles for Israel, providing them with instruction, yea, in addition, with

[1] *Ubi supra*, i. 37, 38. [2] *Ibid.* i. 39.

the power of office and the ability to work signs and wonders; He preached rules of morality, and announced a moral kingdom of God (2 Cor. iii. 17, xiii. 4; Rom. viii. 3; 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. v. 18, 19, xv. 8. Apostles, Gal. ii. 7 f.; 1 Cor. ix. 14; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 10, compare vi. 9; Gal. v. 21). His position towards the Law and the heathen is not touched upon in detail. So much is certain that Paul . . . expressly knew of the historical limitation of the ministry of Jesus to Israel, and his standing under the Law from His birth to His death (Rom. xv. 8; Gal. iv. 4, &c.). At the same time he also knows of commandments and rules of Jesus which he places beside the Law, even of a 'law of Christ,' to which he subjects himself, while he rejects the law of Moses; yea, he even knows of a 'new covenant,' which Jesus intended to found distinctly upon the Old Covenant by His death (New Covenant, 1 Cor. xi. 25; essentially also Matt. xxvi. 28).[1]

The life of Jesus was crowned with death and the resurrection. At the Passover He was given up into the hands of His enemies, the supreme rulers of His nation, and in His earthly weakness, crucified, slain, and buried (1 Cor. xi. 23, ii. 8, v. 7; compare xi. 23 ff.; 2 Cor. xiii. 4, 1 Cor. xv. 3). In truth, however, He surrendered Himself in self-renunciation and love to mankind . . . . . He endured the reviling of blasphemers, and presented His body and blood as a pure Paschal offering—indeed, as an atoning sacrifice for Israel and for all mankind (Gal. ii. 20; Rom. v. 6, xv. 3, 7; 1 Cor. v. 7; Rom. iii. 25; Gal. iii. 13). And so in the night in which He was betrayed, He celebrated the Passover with His disciples in such a way that under the symbols of bread and wine He offered them His body which He destined for them, and the new covenant which was to be dedicated in His blood; and that He enjoined on them the perpetual repetition of this observance in memory of Him (1 Cor. xi. 23, ff.). But the dead rose again; on the third day, according to the Scriptures, He was raised to life by God and appeared to a series of witnesses, whom one can count and range in order . . . . He was exalted to the right hand of God, a lord of all men

[1] *Ubi supra*, i. 39, 40.

through His resurrection, speedily about to return, as He Himself had promised, to be the judge and king of the quick and the dead (1 Cor. xv. 1, &c.; Rom. viii. 34, xiv. 9; 1 Thess. iv. 15).[1]

But, in his account of Paul's testimony, Keim by no means limits it to a knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus; he recognises the high conception which the Apostle had formed of the Person of Jesus, and how even his independent conceptions witness to the extraordinary impression which the Person of Jesus had called forth immediately after His departure, and even while the blood-stained traces of a criminal's death were fresh. The fulness and height of His being can scarcely be adequately expressed even in the highest conceptions of Messianic dogmatics or Alexandrian philosophy. Much more than a mere man had been present in Him; He is God's own Son, His perfect image, the world was made by Him, it was He who led Israel in the wilderness; at last He appeared upon earth to verify in a miraculous manner all the promises of God; he was the Second Man, after Adam, the heavenly, spiritual, ideal man, after whose image humanity was to be newly created; the flesh, sin, and death being subdued by Him, not only in mankind, but even in the lower creation, the liberty of children conferred, and the whole world for ever brought back to God (compare 1 Cor. xv. 44, viii. 6, x. 4, 9; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 3, 32).[2]

If we have followed Keim thus far, we shall scarcely be surprised when he sums up in this remarkable passage: 'The life of Jesus which Paul presents to us is indeed rich in contents, a Gospel of the first days, which, even if insoluble difficulties should exist in it, makes any further Gospel unnecessary; or rather, one which promises to our Gospels with their flesh and blood of the life of Jesus every kind of illustration and assistance;'[3] and after pointing out the

[1] *Ubi supra*, i. 41. [2] *Ibid.* i. 42.

[3] 'Es ist wahrhaftig ein inhaltreiches Leben Jesu, welches sich uns durch Paulus anbietet, ein Evangelium der ersten Tage, welches jedes weitere Evangelium, wenn unauflösliche Schwierigkeiten ihm aufstünden, entbehrlich macht, welches noch vielmehr den Evangelien mit ihrem Fleisch und Blut des Lebens Jesu Beleuchtung und Beistand jeder Art verspricht' (*Geschichte Jesu*, i. 42).

manner in which other Epistles of the New Testament corroborate St. Paul's testimony to the Gospels,[1] he concludes: 'Though historical examination may yet dispute many of these facts, we have seen formed a solid kernel of the life of Jesus, which resists dissolution, and which is rendered sure and stedfast by the agreement of early witnesses in so many chief points.'[2]

But what strikes us in Keim's examination of St. Paul's testimony is, not merely the remarkable harmony which he admits between the Epistles and the Gospels, but also the value which he attaches to the character of the witness, a value which might at least suggest more careful consideration to the shallow thought which dismisses St. Paul without more ado as 'this strange man,' this madman, this fanatic.

Certainly Keim plainly points out that Paul was not a perfect and infallible critic, that he was a man of his age and nation, and that his very belief in the Messiah had made him likely to receive much as historical which was really not so. But all this is very much modified, when we remember that he describes Paul's conversion as taking place through *doubt and denial*, and that he describes his whole mind as eminently logical. Shall we suppose, asks Keim, that Paul believed in the Messiah, and then troubled himself either not at all or only superficially and in a general way about the facts of His life, those facts which must support or destroy his faith? Quite apart from the scanty notices of the Person of Jesus which we find in his writings, the Apostle's faith must have rested on a knowledge of the life of Jesus sufficiently wide to justify his reasoning, and he presupposes an entirely blameless and noble character, based either upon the Apostle's own experience or upon that of others. And this knowledge of the Apostle was gained, as we see in the case of the Resurrection, not by mere random inquiry, but by a keen, searching, and sceptical observation, by a collection and comparison of all available materials.[3]

But, further, we may notice that Keim even places a weapon

[1] See succeeding chapters. [2] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 44.
[3] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 38.

in the hands of Christian apologists in his treatment of the character of St. Paul.

In the third volume of his 'Geschichte Jesu,'[1] he points out the remarkable fact that apologists have never noticed a circumstance which sheds a new light upon the relatively sober gift of distinguishing visions possessed by Paul. The circumstance is this, that notwithstanding all his belief in the words of Jesus which he had heard in ecstasies and visions (2 Cor. xii. 9), the Apostle never employs such words in communicating Christian doctrine, *but simply the historically spoken words of Jesus* (1 Cor. vii. 10, 25, compare ix. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15, &c.).[2] How convenient would it have been for him to support by the words of a vision his doctrine of the law of the admission of the Gentiles? A proof, indeed, would not by this means be established; *but the fact* (says Keim) *shows that we ought not to carry too far the theory of the Apostle's visionary character.*

But there is one further point in Keim's examination of Christian sources which claims our attention.

Although we cannot maintain that either of our Gospels was in St. Paul's hands, or, indeed, that he possessed any written Gospel, it is to be noted that Keim makes special references to the close connection between the testimony of Paul and the Gospel of St. Matthew, which in Keim's judgment was written in its complete form as early as 66 A.D. 'Amongst the oldest Christian sources Paul specially confirms the representations of this Gospel both in general and in particular: in details he narrates with an almost literal identity the Davidic descent of Jesus, His human birth, His Jewish attitude, His doctrinal teaching, His teaching of the Apostles, His teaching as to the future, His institution of the Lord's Supper, the reproaches uttered against Him as He was dying, His burial, and His resurrection.'[3] We are accustomed to hear of the close connection between the Pauline writings and the Pauline Gospel of Luke, but here we find that, at any

[1] Vol. iii. p. 583, note.

[2] It is doubtful whether this particular passage can be so employed, but Keim's general argument holds good.

[3] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 64.

rate in Keim's judgment, the connection between the facts of our Gospels and the facts of the Epistles is apparent in St. Matthew no less than in St. Luke.[1]

But the numerous instances which Keim adduces to show that the Epistles bear witness to the historical Christ are confirmed to a great extent by another writer of the same school, Adolf Hausrath, in his 'Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte.' In Hausrath's view the fact that Paul seeks out, not only Peter, one of the Twelve, but also James, one of the family circle of Jesus (Gal. i. 19), is distinct evidence that he wished to gain accurate information as to the historical basis of his belief. And although Paul certainly never knew Jesus in the flesh, and had no intercourse with His disciples before his conversion, it by no means follows from the scanty references in his Epistles that he was unacquainted with the historical presentation of Christianity. His twofold residence in Damascus and his visit to Jerusalem were sufficient to set clearly before him, with the possible assistance of a written Gospel, all that was generally known of the life of Jesus. And if in his writings the historical element is put on one side, and he deduces the Messiahship of Jesus more from the Old Testament than from His earthly life, and if the details of that life appear less dear to his heart than the death which was so full of significance, all this is due, in Hausrath's opinion, not to a deficiency of knowledge, but to the speculative tendency of the Apostle's mind.[2]

'But that in a given case he knew how to set forth historical facts even in detail is proved by his own utterance to the Galatians, that he had so painted[3] Jesus before their eyes as the Crucified, that he never thought to have occasion to fear that they would turn aside to another Gospel (Gal. iii. 1). In addition to this his knowledge embraces the whole life of Jesus. He mentions His descent from David, and knows of His baptism, which he himself repeats in his con-

[1] For the connection between Paul and Luke's Gospel, see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 77–81; and for a connection between Paul and Mark's Gospel, maintained by other modern critics, see below, chap. v.

[2] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 68, 69.

[3] On the force of this word (*gemalt*) see below, chap. vi. p. 349

verts, and which he has represented symbolically and allegorically in his own sayings (Rom. i. 3, ix. 5 ; Col. ii. 11 ; 1 Cor. x. 2 ; Rom. vi. 3, 4 ; 1 Cor. xii. 13 ; Gal. iii. 27). He knows of the preaching of the kingdom, and the mission of the Apostles, and the power over the spirits which had been conferred upon them (2 Cor. xii. 12 ; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, 29 ; Gal. iii. 5) ; he is so accustomed to speak of them as "the twelve," the name by which they were known during the lifetime of Jesus, that he even uses this expression when it was no longer exact (1 Cor. xv. 5). The life of poverty which Jesus lived, the spirit of mildness and gentleness which pervaded it, the self-forgetting, humble, ministering love which constituted "the life of Jesus"—all this is fully present to the Apostle (Phil. ii. 4–8 ; 2 Cor. v. 14 ; Gal. ii. 20 ; Phil. i. 8). He possesses a more accurate knowledge of the history of the Passion than the Evangelists themselves. At least his account of the Last Supper of Jesus "in the night in which he was betrayed" decisively corrects all differences of the Synoptists (1 Cor. xi. 23) ; he is aware that the rulers of this world, and not the people, were the agents in the death of Jesus ; the treachery of Judas, the revilings of the Crucified, His weakness on the Cross, to which the inscription of the Proconsul was nailed (1 Cor. ii. 8 : 1 Cor. xi. 23 ; Rom. xv. 5 ; 2 Cor. xiiii. 4 ; Col. ii. 14)—all this stands in such a lifelike manner before his eyes that he is able to paint it before the eyes of others also. Most minute and clear is his recital of the appearances of the Risen One. Two of these appearances, viz. those to James, and to the five hundred brethren, we know only through Paul, for the accounts of them are lost in the canonical Gospels. These facts the Apostle has certainly learnt "from flesh and blood," and herein at any rate he has been "instructed by men," as he on occasion expressly says : "I have first of all delivered to you that which I also received" (1 Cor. xv. 3). But not less minute than his knowledge of the history of Jesus is his knowledge of the sayings of the Lord, and he has evidently taken pains to learn the directions of Jesus with regard to all weighty questions. Where he has no such direction he especially gives prominence to its absence (1 Cor.

vii. 25). As proofs he uses, according to Rabbinic custom, only words of the Old Testament, and an express quotation of the words of the Lord is quite exceptional. But the indirect references to the sayings and parables of Jesus are much more numerous. At times he appears to refer to words of Jesus which in all probability are lost to us (*e.g.* 1 Thess. iv. 15).'[1]

In a lengthy note Hausrath gives instances of these indirect references. 'A real quotation is 1 Cor. ix. 14 and 1 Thess. ii. 6, both of which are founded on Luke x. 7. In the same manner 1 Cor. vii. 10, which refers to Matt. v. 32. The indirect allusions are more numerous: thus Rom. xiv. 4 reminds us of the uncharitable judge in Matt. vii. 1. The explanatory statement (1 Cor. vi. 12) with regard to Christian freedom and charitable consideration is suggested by Matt. xvii. 26, 27, "The blind guides" in Rom. ii. 19 is an expression taken from Matt. xv. 14, and the description of the kingdom in Rom. xiv. 17, from Matt. v. 3. "Eat what is set before you" (1 Cor. x. 27) is also the watchword of Luke x. 8, Matt. xv. 11. The faith which removeth mountains in 1 Cor. xiii. 2 is derived from Matt. xvii. 20; the "yea, yea," of 2 Cor. i. 17 from Matt. v. 37. The expression "reviled we bless" is taken from Matt. v. 41, which is thus proved to be genuine. But most fully are the explanatory statements of the Apostle with reference to the "last things" saturated with references to the eschatological discourses of Jesus. Thus St. Paul compares himself, on the day of the Lord's coming, to a bride's-man (2 Cor. xi. 2) with reference to the figure of the bridegroom, Matt. ix. 15, xxv. 1–12. In the same manner, the coming of believers with the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 14) is derived from Matt. xxiv. 30. The trumpet (1 Thess. iv. 16) is also derived from Matt. xxiv. 31; so, too, the coming with clouds from Matt. xxiv. 30. The thief in the night (1 Thess. v. 1) is derived from Matt. xxiv. 36: not to mention many less distinct allusions, as, *e.g.*, to the parable of the sower, the vineyard, the plough.'[2]

The testimony of Keim and Hausrath has been thus

[1] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 69, 70.

[2] Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70, note.

cited at some length, in order that its collective force may be seen in relation to the historical Christ of St. Paul ; but it must not be forgotten that both these writers are not giving us a mere enumeration of historic details, but that, for each of them, it is the personality of Jesus which clothes the bare facts with life and power.[1]

Keim's reverent and striking acknowlegment of the marvellous impression made by the personality of Jesus cannot be lightly put aside.[2] It is this fact which caused him to reject with such scorn the attempt of Strauss to write a 'Leben Jesu' without taking into account the Pauline Epistles; in face of the firm historical ground afforded by the testimony of Paul, Keim can only regard Strauss's summary attempt to dissolve the life of Jesus into a mythology scattered to the four winds of heaven as an act of precipitate rashness ('Geschichte Jesu,' 1875, dritte Bearbeitung, p. 21, 2. Aufl.).

And here we may mention another 'Life of Jesus' with the same tendency as that of Keim, although far inferior to it in richness and beauty,[3] a work of which recent criticism has made special mention.[4] Here again we meet with constant admissions of the historical value of the *Hauptbriefe* and of other Epistles of Paul as a testimony to the words and deeds of Jesus, and here, too, we find another acknowledgment of the surpassing impression which Jesus of Nazareth must have made upon those around Him.

Wittichen places Paul foremost amongst the contemporary Christian witnesses to the origin of Christianity.[5] To estimate rightly the value of Paul's testimony he points out that it is above all things necessary to state when and how he came into contact with the first followers of Jesus, and had

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 621–667. Hausrath, *ubi supra*, ii. 298, 299; comp. his preface to vol. i.

[2] The same striking testimony meets us more recently in Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte*. See especially vol. i. pp. 40, 46 *note*, 55, 56, 59 *note*, 64–69, 114. 'Hinter dem Evangelium und in demselben steht die *Person* Jesu Christi. Diese hat die Gemüther bezwungen, so dass sie sich ihr zu eigen gaben' (p. 114).

[3] Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, 1876.

[4] E. de Pressensé, *Jésus-Christ*, Introd. p. 21, 7th edit. 1884; and Dr. Edersheim's *Warburtonian Lectures*.

[5] Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 12–18.

thereby the opportunity of gaining authentic information as to the Founder of the Christian religion, since Paul's own words in 2 Cor. v. 16 do not involve a personal knowledge of Jesus, but only relate to Paul's cognisance of Jesus' earthly existence in contrast to the celestial glory received at His resurrection. Before he embraced Christianity, the Apostle, as a Pharisee, as a defender of the maintenance of the Jewish tradition with all the energy of a zealot, and blameless in the observance of the Mosaic law, was one of the most eager persecutors and destroyers of the infant Christian community (Gal. i. 14, Phil. iii. 5, Gal. i. 13, 1 Cor. xv. 9). But as this persecution presupposes that Paul had a knowledge of Christianity and its Founder, and recognised therein a danger which threatened the authority of Mosaism, so also in this very persecution he must of necessity have received information of the manner in which the Christians conceived of Jesus. But, in Wittichen's opinion, what Paul learnt in this way bears undoubtedly the stamp of authentic information ; for if we compare the statement of the Apostle, to the effect that he escaped from Damascus, so as not to be taken prisoner by the commander of King Aretas (2 Cor. xi. 32), with his utterances as to his stay in the same town of Damascus (Gal. i. 17), his conversion to Christianity must have happened only a few years after the death of Jesus, since an occupation of Damascus by the commander of Aretas could only have occurred between the year 37 (when Vitellius, at the command of Tiberius, prepared himself for an expedition against Aretas : Jos. 'Antiq.' xviii. 5, 3) and the year 59 (when Arabia was divided by Caligula : Dio Cassius, lix. 9, 12).

But Wittichen not only carries up Paul's sources of information by this historical notice to within a few years of the death of Jesus, he also points out that Paul stood in close connection with the primitive Apostles. Three years after his conversion he goes up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter, and remains there fifteen days (Gal. i. 18) ; fourteen years later he repeats this journey in order to explain to the Church of Jerusalem, and especially James, Peter, and John, the gospel which he had preached to the heathen, and by their

agreement with it to obtain from others also a recognition of his undertaking (Gal. ii. 2, 9). By such means, Wittichen observes, the best opportunity must necessarily have been afforded to the Apostle of correcting and supplementing his information of the historical activity of Jesus. But that Paul did not disdain the tradition of this latter is made evident by more than one circumstance. Although he is conscious of having received his gospel by an inward and divine revelation, and although he wishes no longer to know Christ after the flesh, yet by this gospel there is meant the glad tidings of justification by faith in the crucified and risen Christ (1 Cor. xv. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4), but not the knowledge of the earthly activity of Jesus; this latter expression only relates to the earthly form of existence, and not to the ideal import of the historical Christ. Just as the latter must rather form the basis of Paul's ideal conception of Christ, from a recognition of which his conversion and the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him are alone explainable, so the Apostle, as we shall see, goes back to those historical events of the life of Jesus in which that ideal import appears, and appeals directly to tradition (1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 3, ix. 14, vii. 25; 1 Thess. iv. 5).

Paul's conception, therefore, of the celestial Christ is, according to Wittichen, nothing else than the highest expression for the spiritual import of the historical Christ, and in the fundamental conceptions of his theology, viz. justification by faith, the new creation of humanity, the filial relation to God acquired by the possession of the divine Spirit, freedom from the Mosaic law—in all these we have to acknowledge abstractions formed out of concrete events in the activity and the preaching of Jesus, just as also the Spirit of Christ is for Paul fundamentally nothing else than the mode of thinking of the historical Christ raised to a religious ethical principle (comp. Rom. viii. 9 with 1 Cor. ii. 16); that there was no discrepancy between the two is guaranteed to us in the recognition of Paul's gospel by the original Apostles, and by his own undoubted consciousness that he only preached the thoughts of Christ (1 Cor. i. 12, ii. 2, iii. 11). On account, therefore, of these relations, Paul's statements about Christ are of great value

for a knowledge of the fundamental character of the historical activity of Jesus. But Paul's conversion also throws a clear light upon the Person of Jesus; for if a fanatical Pharisee, a man full of strength in spirit and in will, a man of bold independence of character, converted to the faith of those whom he has persecuted, overcome by their testimony to the Crucified, acknowledges the Messiah in One whom the Jews regarded as rejected by God, and if he dates from the appearance of such an One a new period in the life of humanity, just as from his own conversion he dates a new period in his own individual life (1 Cor. xiii. 11; Gal. iv. 1 ff.), Jesus, however secretly He may have worked, must have left upon the minds of His followers a signal impression.

So far Wittichen plainly recognises, not only the special means which Paul possessed of obtaining information as to the Founder of the Christian Church, but also the fact that the Apostle made the most of his sources of information: even when he insists most strongly upon Paul's ideal conception of Christ, he is by no means prepared to dissociate it from the Apostle's acquaintance with, and reference to, historical events in the life of the historical Jesus.

But Wittichen's recognition of the value of Paul's testimony becomes more significant when we examine it in detail, even if we confine ourselves to those Epistles which he is willing to accept as genuine. Thus, according to Paul, Jesus is descended from the seed of David (Rom. i. 3);[1] He was man in the full sense of the word (Gal. iv. 4, comp. Job xiv. 1; Rom. v. 15, viii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 21), born under the Mosaic law, and receiving accordingly the rite of circumcision as a sign that He belonged to the covenant people (Gal. iv. 4). The historical activity of Jesus, according to Paul, was confined to the Jews, for he was called to fulfil the Messiah's promises made to the Jews (Rom. ix. 4). As to the character of the life of Jesus, Paul only gives us general intimations. He was conscious of no sin (2 Cor. v. 21), He was obedient to the divine will even unto death (Phil. ii. 8), and was filled

[1] Wittichen rejects the supernatural birth of Jesus, and holds that Rom. i. 3 points to his birth of a human marriage (p. 14).

with the spirit of holiness (Rom. i. 4; 2 Cor. v. 21), judgments which, even if they should only be retrospective conclusions from the Apostle's firm belief in the exaltation of Christ to heavenly glory, must yet, according to what has been said above, be referred to the impression which the personality of Jesus made upon His disciples; out of love towards men He led an obscure mode of life in comparison with His high destiny (2 Cor. viii. 9). Of particular events in the life of Jesus he mentions in detail the institution of the Lord's Supper, His betrayal perpetrated by night (1 Cor. 23–28), His non-recognition by the rulers of this world (1 Cor. ii. 8), in contrast with whom He was outwardly without strength (2 Cor. xiii. 4), His inward joy under outward pressure of persecution (1 Thess. i. 6), His surrender of Himself to death out of love for man (Rom. viii. 37; Gal. ii. 20), His sufferings (2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10), and His crucifixion at the Passover (1 Cor. v. 7), by which the pretended Messiah appeared to the men of His day as a rejected sinner, or as a foolish man (Gal. iii. 13; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. v. 21).

But Paul must also have been acquainted with miraculous powers proceeding from Jesus; for if amongst the gifts of the Spirit he recognises the gift of healing in the Christian Church of his day (1 Cor. xii. 9 and 28, comp. Gal. iii. 3); if in opposition to his opponents, who disputed his Apostolic rank, he also quotes the fact that he had given proof of his Apostleship by signs, wonders, and mighty deeds (2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5), we must draw the conclusion that similar deeds had already been performed also by Jesus, since Paul represents them as an operation of the divine Spirit—that is to say, of the Spirit of Christ (Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 1–7, xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 17). But from the manner in which Paul reproached the Jews for seeking in Jesus a sign (as a proof of his Messianic dignity), whilst the Apostles preached that which was to the Jews a stumbling-block, viz. a crucified Christ, we are equally justified in concluding that those operations to which Paul appealed were no signs in the sense of the Jews, and that surely only on this account, because they were of no fantastical character. The Apostle has also occasionally introduced

particular sayings of Jesus, or at least has referred to them. Thus, according to Paul, Jesus, whose sayings the Apostle carefully distinguishes from his own, has commanded that the wife depart not from her husband (1 Cor. vii. 10, comp. 12), and to virgins he has given no command against their marriage (verse 25) ; so, too, the Apostle knows of a command of Jesus that those who preached the gospel should live of the gospel (1 Cor. ix. 14) ; so, again, he knows of a word of Jesus to the effect that at His return believers who were already dead would precede 'us' (those who should be then alive) in that consummation—where the word 'us' at once teaches us that according to Paul Jesus had promised His return before the existing generation had passed away (1 Thess. iv. 15).

But further: Wittichen points out the special significance of the conclusions as to the attitude of Jesus towards the Mosaic law and worship which we can draw from Paul's bearing and principles. Paul's hostility to Christianity when a Pharisee can only be explained by the fact that the principles of Jesus formed a sharp contrast to Judaism ; and this same contrast Paul when he became a Christian historically and logically developed. He informs us of the words employed by Jesus at the institution of the Last Supper: 'This cup is [figuratively] the new covenant [which is founded] in my blood' (1 Cor. xi. 25), words which form in themselves a contrast to the Mosaic covenant, which the Apostle elsewhere characterises as a contrast between the spirit and the letter, between willing obedience and the compulsion of external ordinances, between sonship and moral freedom on the one hand, and slavery on the other (2 Cor. iii. 3 and 5 ; Gal. iv. 22), and which can be referred with the more certainty to the work of Jesus, since it had been partly anticipated by the prophets (comp. *e.g.* Jer. xxxi. 33 ; Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26).

The validity of the Mosaic law is in Paul's view cancelled in principle by Christ, *i.e.* in its ceremonial elements altogether, but according to its ethical precepts only in so far as they took the form of external ordinances ; in its stead the Apostle places the Spirit dwelling in man by faith, the inner moral instinct for good, the power of love, the law of faith (Gal. iv.

4, v. 18 ; Rom. iii. 28, xiii. 10) ; the ethics of the Mosaic law only become truths through the law of Christ (Rom. iii. 31, xiii. 10 ; Gal. v. 14) ; this reform is accomplished by the death of Jesus, in so far as this act of free obedience towards God has aroused the same spirit in His disciples (Rom. v. 19 ; Gal. ii. 20, v. 24). But all this Wittichen would trace back to the influence of Jesus, since the unconditional confidence with which Paul announces such views as the religion of Christ Gal. i. 7 ff.), and his appeal to the recognition of his gospel by the immediate pupils and Apostles of Jesus (Gal. ii. 9), are a guarantee that his principles are in reality an adequate expression of tendencies which already lay in the teaching of Jesus.

But Wittichen does not think that we are justified in concluding that Jesus in His own preaching entirely emancipated Himself from the enactments of the Mosaic law, for upon that supposition the difference which arose between Paul on the one side and Peter and James on the other, with regard to the observance of the Jewish law in the Church at Antioch where Gentile Christians preponderated, would not be explained, inasmuch as the procedure of Peter and James must have been supposed to be supported by the authority of Jesus, even if that authority was misunderstood. The facts of the case in Wittichen's judgment tend rather to show that Jesus did not indeed ascribe to the Jewish worship any importance for His religion, though in many things he conformed to Jewish custom, either out of regard to the prejudice of His countrymen, or for the maintenance of Jewish nationality. Only in cases where it concerned Him to act in a reforming spirit, and when the Jewish law hindered His work, did He disregard it, leaving the practical working out of His principles to the future.

The facts upon which Wittichen bases this view of the conduct of Jesus are, as he tells us, in the first place, the vacillating behaviour of Peter at Antioch, whom Paul reckons amongst those who know that a man is not justified by the deeds of the law (Gal. ii. 15), and who at first acts conformably with this principle, but afterwards at the bidding of James opposes it ; in the next place, the behaviour of Paul himself, who for the sake of gaining Jews to the Gospel con-

formed to Jewish custom (1 Cor. ix. 20); finally, the circumstance that the Apostle represents Jesus as subjected to the law by His birth and circumcision (Gal. iv. 4).

Amongst other information of importance, with regard to the primitive Apostles and the early Church, which Paul supplies as occasion offered, Wittichen notes the fact that he knows twelve Apostles of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5) who were His immediate disciples (comp. Gal. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 16); amongst these twelve he makes special mention of Peter, who occupied a prominent position amongst his comrades (Gal. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 5); and John (Gal. ii. 5); he further remarks of the Apostles that they were married (1 Cor. ix. 5), a fact which has an important bearing upon the views of Jesus with regard to marriage; by the side of these Apostles he mentions also the brethren of Jesus according to the flesh, and calls one of them James (1 Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 7). Wittichen further draws attention to the fact that according to Paul the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews was intrusted to the primitive Apostles; and in this he finds a confirmation of his earlier conclusion that Jesus sought His followers first of all amongst Jews only. Nevertheless, he points out that the extension of Christianity amongst the Gentiles must also have found a place within the horizon of Jesus, since the primitive Apostles recognised Paul and Barnabas as Apostles to the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 9).[1] It is evident that Wittichen is not prepared to accept the extreme views of the Tübingen school as to the opposition between Paul and the Twelve. That Paul was in fact recognised by the original Apostles as an Apostle, and not merely as an assistant to those who were Apostles, is plainly seen from his remark that he remained independent of them, and that they had extended the right hand of fellowship to him and Barnabas (Gal. ii. 6 and 9). But also the assertion that the original Apostles had acknowledged that the Gospel to the Gentiles had been intrusted to him, as the Gospel of the Jews was to them, can only be understood in this same sense, since immediately after it

[1] Comp. the remarks of Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, pp. 609-612, 1890.

mention is made of the office of Apostle amongst the Jews and amongst the Gentiles, so that the office to both appears as equivalent.[1]

On the whole we may say that Wittichen's testimony, although it does scanty justice to Paul's Christology, credits the Apostle with a very considerable knowledge of the historical Jesus, a knowledge which Wittichen establishes by the inferences which he draws, as well as by the series of facts to which he refers.[2]

It is always of interest to notice Weizsäcker's attitude with regard to any question bearing upon the relation between Paul and the earlier Apostles, not only on account of the prominent part which he has played in German theological literature, but also because he was Baur's successor at Tübingen.

Although Weizsäcker quotes 2 Cor. v. 16 as a proof that Paul attached no value to the earthly life of Jesus, since it had accomplished its aim, and its significance was past; and although he maintains that Paul's preaching was centred upon the two great facts of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, and upon the Scriptural proofs to be alleged in their support, so that what for the first Apostles came last, for St. Paul came first—yet it would be most erroneous to conclude from such statements that, in his view, Paul knew nothing of the deeds and words of Jesus.[3]

With regard to the former, he admits that Paul was beyond all doubt acquainted with the Gospel tradition, although his use of this knowledge in his teaching was limited by the fact that he had learnt to know the Risen Christ, and that this idea of Him as the Risen One was the dominant thought of his mind. But still the Apostle does not forget that the religion of the Christ was an historical religion, and, even in the midst of party strife, he never separates the Christian belief from this historical Christ, and never fails to look with pious gaze towards the Church of Jerusalem where

[1] Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 18 and note.

[2] Wittichen (*Leben Jesu*, p. 14, note) accepts the *Hauptbriefe* (with the exception of the greatest part of the last two chapters of the Romans), 1 Thess., Philippians, Philemon, and portions of Colossians and 2 Tim.

[3] *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 28, 35, 98, 112, 122, 123, 141, 142, 150.

the recollection of Jesus was a living and abiding possession. His first visit to that Church and his intercourse with Peter must have been rich in information as to the life and teaching of Jesus.[1]

But it is in the stress which Weizsäcker lays upon St. Paul's acquaintance with the *words* of Jesus that we are most sensible of a difference between his point of view and that of Baur.[2]

The words of Jesus are described as supplying for St. Paul inviolable directions of life; he employs them as decisive in social questions, and even in questions of belief; they are a law equally binding upon him and upon the first disciples from whom he must have received them;[3] and so the same man who could boldly declare, 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, henceforth know we him so no more,' is far removed from basing the regulations of the Christian Churches upon a mere ideal conception.[4]

[1] *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 82, 83, 121, 383, 407.

[2] Comp. *e.g.* p. 618, with Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 301, 302, where Baur, in commenting upon 1 Cor. vii. 25, 40, thinks it impossible that St. Paul in the term ἐπιταγή refers to any traditional command of the Lord, and maintains that the distinction between it and γνώμη was dependent merely upon the subjective consciousness of the Apostle.

[3] 'Das Zusammensein aber musste für Paulus reiche Frucht bringen durch Mittheilungen des Petrus über das Leben und die Lehrworte Jesu. Wenigstens von den letzteren wissen wir, welche Bedeutung dieselben auch für Paulus bekamen; sie sind ihm unverbrüchliche Vorschrift des Lebens, welche er in der Mission und in der Ordnung seiner Gemeinden nachher eben so gut anwendet, als dies nur in Jerusalem geschehen konnte' (*Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 83).

'Dass er (*i.e.* Paulus) die Sprüche Jesus kennt zeigen seine Anführungen. Er braucht sie zur höchsten Entscheidung in Fragen des Lebens und auch in solchen des Glaubens' (*ibid.* p. 121).

'Selbst Paulus beruft sich in heidenchristlichen Gemeinden für Entscheidungen des Lebens auf ein Wort Jesus als bindendes Gebot, dessen Verpflichtung ihm wie der Gemeinde ausser allem Zweifel ist. Sicher hat er diese Gewohnheit daher gewonnen, woher er die Worte selbst entnahm. Er kann dieselben nur von den Uraposteln haben, und sie hatten das gleiche Ansehen in der urapostolischen Gemeinde' (*ibid.* p. 384).

'Der erste, welcher in Schriften auf Worte Jesus zurückgeht, und dieselben als Richtschnur des Verhaltens und Glaubens anführt, ist der Apostel Paulus' (*ibid.* p. 386; comp. pp. 594, 595).

[4] 'Derselbe Mann, welcher das kühne Wort ausgesprochen hat; so kennen wir von jetzt an niemanden mehr nach dem Fleisch; haben wir auch Christus nach dem Fleisch gekannt, davon wissen wir jetzt nichts mehr (2 Kor. v. 16),

It must, indeed, be admitted that if we refer to two other specially representative names of the modern critical school, perhaps the most representative of all, the result of our inquiries is somewhat disappointing; although, even in these cases, the writers are at times constrained to acknowledge how closely St. Paul's teaching is connected with the historical Christ.

Dr. Otto Pfleiderer, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin, and Hibbert Lecturer in London in 1885, has considerably modified the attacks made by the early Tübingen school upon the historical trustworthiness of the Acts of the Apostles; he has not hesitated to state the reasons which militate against the view of a fundamental and irreconcilcable antagonism between Paul and the Twelve;[1] but he lays special emphasis upon the fact that St. Paul's gospel differed from that of the first Apostles, inasmuch as it was based, not upon the outward life of Jesus, but upon an inward vision of His spiritual nature, and therefore upon the spontaneous rise of religious intuitions.

This ideal conception of Christ, this magnificent and daring idealism, which led the Apostle to look upon himself as a new man, who had entered a new world of the spirit, and who no longer knew anything of a Christ after the flesh, was based upon two facts—the Crucifixion and Resurrection of the Lord. These two facts constituted the Alpha and Omega of his gospel, whilst nothing else, not even the life of Jesus on the earth—was, in Pfleiderer's view, taken into consideration at all. How much of that life was known to Paul, and what historical information he may have gained from Peter we cannot tell; the few sayings of Jesus which he quotes relating only to matters of secondary importance, and not to dogmatic teaching. (Pfleiderer compares, in this connection, 1 Cor. ix. 14 with Luke x. 7, and 1 Cor. vii. 10 with Mark x. 11. He adds that in his opinion 1 Cor. x. 27 ought

welcher damit alle Ansprüche des alleinigen Verständnisses der persönlichen Schüler Jesus abgewiesen hat, *ist doch weit entfernt, die Ordnung der Gemeinde auf ein Idealbild zu gründen; vielmehr ist ihm das überlieferte Wort des Herrn unbedingtes Gesetz* (1 Kor. vii. 10, xii. 25; vgl. ix. 14' (*Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 618).

[1] *Das Urchristenthum: seine Schriften und Lehren*, p. 56.

to be regarded as the source of, rather than a quotation from, Luke x. 8.) Even in the Apostle's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper, it is difficult to say how much is derived from tradition, and how much from his own inspirations, and, in Pfleiderer's view, there is 'a dogmatic turn' in the words ascribed to Jesus by Paul on this occasion, by which they differ from the older Gospel tradition. On the very occasions where Paul sets Christ forth as a moral example he does not fix his gaze upon the earthly life of Jesus, but upon the humility which He showed by His Incarnation—that is to say, upon considerations taken, not from history, but from dogma. Only by the one fact of the Crucifixion is Paul connected with the historical Person of Jesus, his gospel was the 'word of the Cross,' his preaching was that of a Christ no longer flesh, but spirit (2 Cor. v. 16), and this gospel was far removed from that of the 'other Jesus,' who lived in the recollection and tradition of the primitive disciples (2 Cor. xi. 4).[1]

But although Pfleiderer insists so strongly that the earthly life of Jesus, with all its details, appeared quite insignificant to Paul, there are occasions when he, too, becomes aware of the value of an historical background to the Apostle's representation of Jesus as the Christ. In opposition, he thinks, to the Corinthian 'Christ party,' Paul had laid great stress on the idealism of his theology; but after closer intercourse with the moderate Jewish Christians, the Petrine section, he may have arrived at the conviction that some weight ought to attach to the earthly personality of Jesus, and to the historical realism which takes account of it. Paul, too, might have been the more inclined to this view from the desire to obtain a salutary counterpoise to the spiritual transcendentalism of the followers of Apollos. The Epistle to the Romans furnishes us with an example of this combination of the historic and the ideal, and we find the Apostle placing the former in the foreground, but in such a manner that the contrast actually heightens the effect of

[1] Comp. *Das Urchristenthum*, pp. 176–178, with *Influence of the Apostle Paul* (Pfleiderer's 'Hibbert Lectures'), pp. 49–55.

the latter. Thus, according to the flesh, Christ is the Son of David, but, according to the spirit of holiness, He is the Son of God; by the flesh He comes from the fathers, and so belongs to Israel, but He is also the Divine Lord, who is over all, whether Jews or Gentiles. (Rom. i. 3, 4; ix. 5; xv. 8.)[1]

And so again in the opening chapter of his 'Influence of Paul,' while he speaks of the Apostle as the originator of Christian theology, he refuses distinctly to occupy the position of some of the earlier Tübingen school (although not of Baur himself), and to attribute Christianity to Paul rather than to Jesus.

'It is true,' he says, 'that the Messianic movement would not have become the universal religion of Christianity without the work of Paul. But it has been forgotten that the work of Paul presupposes as its indispensable basis the personal history of Jesus, without which basis it would be as a castle in the clouds. . . . Christian theology, it is true, dates from Paul, but the Christian religion from Jesus, both his Lord and ours.'[2]

But there is another writer who certainly stands in the very front rank of the modern critical school, and who is sometimes regarded as its leading exponent—Dr. H. J. Holtzmann, Professor in the University of Strassburg.[3]

According to Dr. Holtzmann, two interests were at work in the formation of our Gospels—the dogmatic and the historic—without the former it is impossible to solve the puzzle which the Gospels present; whilst, on the other hand, those critics go too far who would exclude the historic interest altogether. But the picture given us by the Evangelists is

[1] See *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 141, 142. Comp. *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 178.

[2] *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 10, 11.

It is to be noted that Pfleiderer's view of the Pauline Christology leads him to some remarkable statements. Thus he writes, 'He is called also "the Lord" absolutely, the name which is in the Old Testament given to God only. By such conceptions Christ is brought so near to God that we need feel no surprise when Paul at length calls Him without reserve "God who is over all," in order thereby to indicate His pre-eminent dignity and dominion.' *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 55; but comp. p. 56, and *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 240.

[3] The expression of Holtzmann's views is taken from his *Einleitung in das N. T.* and the *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 'Die Synoptiker.'

made up of a hundred little pictures, composed of various incidents in the life of Jesus, of characteristic traits, and oft-repeated sayings. All these were the result of the tradition preserved in the first place by the Church at Jerusalem, and then gradually spreading beyond the limits of Palestine.

The importance attached to this tradition is plainly stated in the earliest no less than in the latest writings of the New Testament (1 Cor. xi. 23, xv. 1, 3, John xiv. 26); it is this tradition which is an indispensable means and a necessary pre-condition of religious belief, and then, afterwards, its carefully-guarded sanctuary. But if once such a form of instruction was a condition of the life of the Church, it might be supposed, as Holtzmann remarks, that some official means of promoting it would have been employed, and he refers to the belief sometimes maintained that in the 'Evangelists' (Acts xxi. 8; Ephes. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 5) we have the representatives of a special office, upon whom the duty devolved of communicating to others the history and the words of Jesus. This, in his opinion, cannot be proved, although in each Church the tradition plays an important part, and it may have been included in the *teaching* (διδασκαλία) which Paul classes with prophesying, revelation, speaking with tongues, interpretation, as one of the regular means of edifying the Church (1 Cor. xiv. 6, 26; Rom. xii. 7). And so, as is usually the case, we find first oral, and then written tradition, when we examine into the earliest Christian sources. The matter of chief importance is the transition from oral tradition to the fixed written form.

And here Holtzmann warns us against arguing from the conditions of our own day, when writing comes first, and whoever has anything new to publish takes up his pen. But Christ, unlike many other religious founders, wrote nothing, and whilst He was zealous for the permanence of the Old Testament Scriptures, He was unconcerned for the fate of His own preaching of the Kingdom.

The 'word' was to do everything, as a *word* which, according to the appropriate expression of the fourth Gospel, was spoken 'in die Welt' (John viii. 26). And the continuance

of the original impression thus made depended entirely, as Holtzmann admits, upon the uniqueness, transcending the limits of common and ordinary humanity, which appertained both to the *word* and to the speaker himself; it depended upon the eternal youth of this *word*, as it retained its own unique originality even amidst oral tradition, and as it prevailed through a whole century over the world of human thought. But this unique word (λόγος) consisted of a whole series of words (λόγοι), which formed the special treasures of the primitive Church. A full reference will be found to the high value which Holtzmann attaches to these sayings in a later chapter; but we may notice here that, in the way in which he introduces them, Holtzmann's remarks remind us of the importance which Weizsäcker also attributes to these 'words of the Lord;' they are for both these writers the oldest and fundamental law which the Church possesses, its highest authority, an oral Canon, as it were, by the side of the written Old Testament, and Holtzmann points out how Paul emphatically raises his voice, and twice underlines, as it were, what he had written, whenever he makes a communication which was not so much his own individual opinion, but rather one connected with a traditional announcement of Christ Himself. (1 Th. iv. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25; 1 Cor. ix. 14, xi. 24, 25.)[1]

Indeed, Holtzmann admits that the possibility of a written record, as early as the date of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, of the most important words of Jesus, and of His commands relating to His Kingdom, is by no means excluded; and although he does not allow that Matthew could possibly have composed such a work as the Canonical Gospel which bears his name, yet he thinks it quite possible that he might have secured against the corruption of continuous oral traditions many of the parables, prophecies, and discourses of Jesus. With the view which he thus intimates, Holtzmann connects the old tradition which affirmed that Matthew com-

[1] Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 100, and *Die Synoptiker*, 1889, p. 15. In *Hand-Commentar*, 'Das älteste Grundgesetz gleichsam den mündlichen Kanon neben dem geschriebenen des A. T. besassen die Gemeinden sonach in den λόγοι κυρίου.'

posed λόγια κυριακά in the Hebrew language.[1] (Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* iii. 39, 16.)

But when we pass from the words to the deeds of Jesus and the historical details of His life, we find that Holtzmann takes his stand upon the fact that the Gospels are not only sources of information as to what Jesus was in Himself, but as to what He was for the Church as the Messiah. If so, there was room, in Holtzmann's opinion, for the widest play of an idealising motive and for dogmatic interests. These centred around the death of Jesus, and to this fact was transferred the picture of the righteous Sufferer of the Psalms, and of the atoning servant of Jehovah in Isaiah—and hence the representation of Jesus as the ideal good man, whose life was the perfect realisation of righteousness in a sinful world. But if the death of Jesus was once conceived of as sacrificial, and interpreted as taking place 'according to the Scriptures' (1 Cor. xv. 3), then an impulse was given to the endeavour to bring the whole preceding life of Jesus, in accordance with Old Testament guidance, under a similar ideal point of view, and to make it the subject of dogmatic religious reflexion, until the process was applied to event after event, and, finally to His birth and generation.

This belief that Jesus was the Christ developed into the simple Creed, which was embodied in such phrases as 'died for us,' 'raised by the Father,' 'coming again in glory.' And this belief, as Holtzmann proceeds to point out, finds its oldest and simplest expression in the Epistles of St. Paul. There is a dark side to the picture which the Apostle draws, the darkness of death; but there is a corresponding bright side, the light of the Easter morn. One can read through the Epistles of St. Paul from the beginning to the end, without finding much else mentioned in the history of Jesus than ever and again these two poles around which for the Apostle the whole significance of the life of the Messiah is gathered: on the one side towers the Cross as the lofty symbol of a great divine act of reconciliation, emerging out of the gloom of the past which has spread over the lowlands—on the other side,

[1] Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 100.

the Resurrection sheds its resplendent light upon the Cross. But in vain will one seek for an answer to such questions as these; when, where, how, of whom was He born, how long did He live, where did He preach? and so forth. Single events, as Holtzmann admits, were unquestionably known to the Apostle in numbers;[1] but with the exception of the incidentally mentioned account of the Last Supper, in which he attached most importance to the words of Jesus, no detail occupied such a prominent place in the foreground of his consciousness that it was of any consequence by the side of those great turning-points to which belief was referred, or that it was even touched upon by the course of ideas which filled the Apostle's letters: 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth know we him so no more' (2 Cor. v. 16). The dogmatic element is therefore, in Holtzmann's opinion, the most weighty in the Apostolic preaching, although this necessarily led back to certain historical considerations, concerned before all else with the death and resurrection of Jesus.

It was from the Passion history[2] first of all that, according to Holtzmann, the gradually increasing historic interest took its starting-point, an interest which, in his opinion, was by no means purely historic, since it existed always in the service of devotion and dogma: one need only read, he maintains, the numerous references to fulfilled prophecies in the history of the Passion to observe the predominance of this dogmatic aim. But Holtzmann notices that no part of the life of Jesus is proportionately so fully recorded as the

[1] Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, p. 16, and comp. *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 100.

[2] 'Kein Theil des Lebens Jesu ist verhältnismässig so ausführlich berichtet wie die Leidensgeschichte. Während es auf allen andern Stationen dieser Lebensbahn noch chaotisch fluthet, und die einzelnen Auftritte, die man sich zu erzählen weiss, nur in einem durchaus losen Verhältnisse unter einander stehen, können wir hier schon fast Tag auf Tag verfolgen, sehen wir die todbringende Wette sich bilden, heranwälzen und überschlagen. Eine mehrere Momente zu einem grösseren Zusammenhang verknüpfende Erzählung von den letzten Stunden Jesu setzt daher schon Paulus voraus, wenn er seinen Bericht über die Abendmahlsstiftung einleitet mit den Worten: "Unser Herr Jesus, in der Nacht da er verrathen ward" (1 Kor. xi. 23).'—Holtzmann, *Die Synoptiker*, p. 17.

history of the Passion, and that whilst around all other stations in the life of Jesus there is a confused and irregular flow, and the several scenes which are narrated only stand in a loose connection with each other, we can here follow almost day by day, we see plainly the fatal wave form, roll on, and overlap. Paul presupposes a narrative of the last hours of Jesus uniting a quantity of incidents in one greater whole, when he introduces his account of the institution of the Supper with the words 'Our Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed' (1 Cor. xi. 23).

But if a writer admits that St. Paul could thus write of the Passion *at such an early date*, and could express himself in a way which shows that his readers were already familiar with the facts to which he alludes; and if the Apostle, *at such an early date*, could make a clear and decisive distinction between his own opinions and the words of the historical Christ, it is a fair inference that he had more information at his command, if occasion demanded; and it seems absolutely impossible, in face of this knowledge of concrete facts, to speak of his Gospel as a mere idealism, and to refuse to recognise that he paints something more than an ideal picture.[1]

But we are reminded by other writers besides Holtzmann, that the significance of the Passion history, and the importance attached to it in the earliest days of the Church, cannot be denied.[2]

M. Renan has repeatedly insisted on the fact that St. Paul had never seen Jesus nor heard His voice; that it is easy to understand how much more easily in his case the human figure of the Saviour was transformed into a metaphysical type than in the case of Peter, and of the others who had talked with Jesus; that Paul was ignorant, or pretended to be ignorant of the historical Jesus; the divine λόγια, the parables, he scarcely knew; the Christ who makes personal revelations

[1] Compare Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 56, and Weizsäcker, *ut supra*.

[2] So Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 163, 6. Aufl., although he admits that other facts, and countless sayings echoed in the Epistles, formed the daily spiritual food of the Churches.

to him is a phantom of his own imagination; he listens to himself, and thinks that he hears Jesus.[1]

But with regard to the words of Jesus, it is difficult to believe that Paul was so very ignorant of them, even on Renan's own statements. He allows, *e.g.*, by long quotations from 1 and 2 Thess., that twenty years after the death of Jesus only a single essential feature had been added to the picture of the day of the Lord as Jesus had painted it, viz. the character of an Anti-Christ;[2] he admits that Paul had passed at all events some few days in the centre of the Apostolic traditions, and in converse with the Apostles at Jerusalem—Jerusalem, where the image of Jesus, as portrayed in the Gospels, was known in all essential particulars; he refers elsewhere to the remarkable manner in which at least one of those Apostles whom Paul met—James, the Lord's brother—had kept in memory the words of Jesus: those maxims which were incessantly repeated, and those moral sentences which were the food of the Church.[3]

But it is the history of the Passion and its details, which Renan admits were stereotyped and known by heart in the earliest oral tradition of the Church; and it is a part of this tradition, perhaps most of it, which was known to St. Paul, although, beyond doubt, he had no written words of Jesus in his hands.[4]

When, however, M. Renan asserts that Paul's quotations of the words of Jesus are doubtful, and do not correspond with the discourses which the Synoptists put into His mouth ('L'Antechrist,' p. 60), we may fairly reply that such a state-

[1] Renan's *Saint Paul*, 12th edit. 1888, pp. 308, 563; *L'Antechrist*, 3rd edit., 1873, pp. 60, 84; *Les Évangiles*, p. 269.

[2] *Saint Paul*, pp. 250–252.

[3] *Les Évangiles*, pp. 77–87. *L'Antechrist*, pp. 54, 62.

[4] *Les Évangiles*, p. 78, and note. *L'Antechrist*, p. 117, and comp. pp. 60, 61. Renan's description of the closeness with which Christian tradition followed the scenes of the Passion often reminds us of the expressions used by Holtzmann, in reference to the same subject. But although Renan, like Holtzmann, lays stress upon the way in which the early Christians idealised these and other scenes, he not only admits that many of the incidents may be historical, but that *the essential features* in the picture of the suffering Jesus *were very early fixed in the memory of the faithful.*

ment, in so far as it implies ignorance of the words of Jesus, is at variance with the stress laid by such critics as Weizsäcker and Holtzmann, to say nothing of others, upon the significant line of demarcation which the Apostle draws between his own *dicta* and the sayings of the Lord; that even if the quotations are doubtful, they are exactly what we might expect if, as Renan positively affirms, Paul had no writing before him, and must therefore have been quoting from memory, or from the form of oral tradition which he had received. Moreover, it is extremely difficult to believe that St. Paul was so scantily acquainted with the words and acts of Jesus, when we find that within the limits of our Epistles he is able to refer to His commands with regard to marriage, and to the incidents of the last hours of His life, in order to settle questions which happened at the time of his writing to disturb and divide the Church at Corinth.

But one of the best answers to M. Renan's attitude with regard to St. Paul's testimony was given by one of his own countrymen, the learned historian and theologian, Dr. E. de Pressensé. He points out that amongst the Pauline letters there are some before which the boldest criticism is silent, and in his view this judgment includes, not only the letters to the Romans and the Corinthians, but also the first Epistle to the Thessalonians.

These Epistles, which may certainly be assigned to some time between the years 50 and 60 A.D., confirm, he says, at a glance all the principal facts of the life of Jesus as these are recorded in the Gospels. His divine origin, His humiliation, His miracles, His death on the cross, His resurrection, His reign in heaven—all these great facts of Gospel history are the subject of exhortations, of burning appeals, of the mysterious raptures of the Apostle. But this testimony becomes all the more striking, continues De Pressensé, because the Apostle does not enter into any continuous narrative, but makes perpetual allusions to the history, as if nothing was more familiar to his readers. It is evident that he draws from the common source of primitive tradition, and that this tradition was so well established twenty years after Christ, that

it could be alluded to in a general manner without explanation or discussion. Upon this tradition the Church rests as on a solid foundation, and thus we touch the rock below the shifting sands of legend. It is not possible, he adds, that in this short interval a tradition so clear and positive could have been fortuitously born of a capricious mythology. Nor does De Pressensé omit to mention that St. Paul met at Jerusalem Peter, James, and John ; that he frequently returned to the metropolis of the primitive Church, and had opportunity on the very theatre of the Gospel history to interrogate its first witnesses. He lived in the midst of those five hundred Christians who saw the Risen Redeemer (1 Cor. xv. 6).

We are thus carried back, he maintains, to the very time of Christ, and those thirty years which are demanded for the growth of the Christian mythology are altogether wanting, and we may therefore assert that, apart from our canonical writings, the principal events in the life of Jesus are guaranteed by the unanimous testimony of the primitive Church. The more complete narratives (the Gospels) are not isolated ; they are so linked with all the tradition of the first century that, even if they failed us, Christian truth would stand in its entirety, on the sole basis of documents which have obtained universal assent. These documents could not, indeed, replace our Gospels, as conveying a knowledge of the life of Jesus ; for if they preserve its essential facts, they yet give only an imperfect idea of them, for the very reason that they presuppose the basis of tradition on which they were built.[1]

In a later part of his book De Pressensé reminds us that at first 'the Gospel' did not bear the signification of a writing, a book ; it stood always for the divine realities of salvation, the work of Christ, His death and His resurrection : it was the proclamation of the good news of pardon, and this use of the word evidently results from its frequent use in the Synoptics by Jesus Himself : 'To the poor the gospel is preached' (Luke vii. 22) ; it is in this sense that Paul speaks of his Gospel at a time when there may not have been one line

[1] *Jésus-Christ*, pp. 181, 182, 7th edit. 1884.

written of our canonical narratives (Gal. i. 8). All the expressions employed in the New Testament to designate the proclamation of the new truth are independent of the notion of written documents (λόγος, Jas. i. 23 ; λόγος ἀκοῆς, Heb. iv. 2 ; κήρυγμα, Tit. i. 3). The Gospel had been spoken long before it was written, and the Apostolic Church, especially in its first period, might be called the Church of oral testimony.[1]

But such a view, as De Pressensé is careful to state, by no means implies that this testimony was uncertain or fluctuating ; on the contrary, it was fixed in its essential features at a very early stage.

It appears that, from the first, the testimony which was to be the rule and check was that of the Apostles themselves (Acts i. 21, 22), and their preaching thus formed, as it were, the nucleus of evangelical tradition. The discourses of St. Peter (if we may credit the Acts of the Apostles) set forth the great facts of the life of Jesus with a manly simplicity, which engraves them readily on the memory. That which he delivered in the house of the centurion Cornelius, and of which we have only a summary, presents a sort of epitomised Gospel, which reminds us of St. Mark's narratives. We have in the Acts only the Apostle's apologetic discourses, those commands in which he confines himself to the most general facts, but in the inner circle of the Church, as we learn from St. Paul's account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor., the Apostolic testimony expanded into far greater richness of detail. We see from 1 Cor. xi. that before perhaps the composition of a single one of our Gospels, the account of the Lord's Supper was fixed in the remembrance of the Church. Clearly St Paul and St. Luke draw from the same source.[2]

Nor is there any difficulty in the evangelical tradition thus assuming a more exact and definite form. Is not, asks De Pressensé, the Jewish nation pre-eminently the nation of traditions? The teaching of their synagogue was preserved orally for nearly two centuries before being embodied in the

[1] *Jésus-Christ*, pp. 199, 200. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 200-202.

Talmud. The Rabbis kept for nearly seven hundred years a purely grammatical tradition. Assuredly, as he says, the Gospel history would not be too heavy a weight on the memory of men to whom it was the one concern, and who fed upon it as their daily bread. Moreover, the Epistles bear witness that, quite apart from the great features of the Gospel history, the teaching of the Master was retained in a very exact form. There are allusions to the words of Jesus which are almost verbal quotations. Without dwelling on the incident mentioned above of the institution of the Lord's Supper, which, he thinks, points beyond doubt to the fact that St. Paul and St. Luke drew from the same source, De Pressensé gives other instances to support his argument. We find St. Paul adducing a saying of Christ's which is found word for word in the third Gospel (1 Tim. v. 17, 18 ; Luke x. 7 ; see also 1 Cor. ix. 14 ; Luke x. 7, 8). In 1 Cor. the same Apostle pronounces that the Christian may eat whatsoever is set before him. Here, too, we have a lesson of the Master's preserved by St. Luke (1 Cor. x. 27 ; Luke x. 8) ; and again, in 1 Cor. vii. St. Paul appeals on the question of marriage to the very words of Jesus which we find in our Gospels (1 Cor. vii. 10 ; Mark x. 7–9).[1] It follows, in De Pressensé's view, from these significant passages, that before the composition of our canonical narratives, Apostolic tradition was in part fixed, especially as regards the words of the Master. The lesser writings referred to by St. Luke in his Preface had, he thinks, no doubt an important share in this result, and he sees no difficulty in admitting that at this early period a nucleus of common tradition was formed, which remained as a solid basis underlying the diversity of relations, and which circulated from Church to Church.[2]

But it must never be forgotten that if Paul's preaching,

[1] *Ubi supra*, pp. 203–6.—De Pressensé seems to include words in this reference to the command of Christ which are not always connected so closely with the verses in 1 Cor. vii. 'When Paul says,' he writes, 'that the Lord commands, "Let not the wife depart from her husband" (1 Cor. vii. 10), he carries us back to Mark x. 7–9, "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." On the question of divorce, the Apostle refers to Luke xvi. 18.'

[2] *Ibid.* p. 206.

and the earliest Christian tradition, centred around the great facts of the death and resurrection of Jesus, nothing was more natural to men into whose hearts the Gospel had shone as a revelation of the face of God in Jesus Christ—of God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself—to whom it had come as a deliverance from the kingdom of darkness, and from the power of Satan unto God, as a message of freedom from the bands of sin and death, as the redemption of the world, and as the hope of glory. 'I have no other holy annals,' said an unknown Christian, 'but Jesus Christ, His Cross, His Death and Resurrection.' Such words are the very motto, as De Pressensé describes them, of the Church of the second century, rising in a body to be the irrefragable witness of the events of the first; such words show us how the souls of the early Christians fed on the great facts of the Gospel history, and how this Gospel was written in their deepest hearts.[1]

The recollection of all this may help to explain to us what at first sight seems puzzling in a writer like Dr. B. Weiss, and his disposition to admit such scanty references in the Pauline Epistles to the life of Jesus. Not by any means that he is concerned to maintain St. Paul's ignorance of the facts, but he thinks that in most recent delineations of the life of Jesus one thing in particular has been overlooked, viz.[2] that at the foundation of the collective Apostolic preaching there lies the presupposition that the work of Christ was not completed during His earthly life—that this was rather the pre-condition and the beginning of a work which will be carried on by the Risen Christ with means entirely new, with all-embracing success, a work which will only be completed in the future. In the same way also this preaching from the first involved the presupposition, that Christ, through His heavenly exaltation, had become something quite different from what He was in His earthly life; and the more the knowledge was matured of the eternal divine being of Christ,

[1] *Ubi supra* p. 177. ἐμοὶ δε ἀρχαῖα ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (Ignat. *Ad Philadelph.* c. viii. The words have at all events, in Pressensé's words, 'the stamp of high antiquity.'

[2] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 11 and 24.

so much the more did it become self-evident that His earthly human life was a state of self-emptying and abasement upon which He had entered for the accomplishment of His work, and from which He returned to His full divine glory only after His exaltation. It is therefore a self-evident result that the very thing which constitutes for the Apostolic preaching the unique importance of His Person and work cannot receive full expression in His earthly human life ; and only thus can it in truth be explained why this preaching refers so very seldom to the earthly life of Jesus and its details.

Accordingly, in the view of Dr. Weiss, salvation and faith in the salvation made manifest in Christ, are by no means dependent upon the historical knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus ; and in a remarkable passage he affirms that the Christian faith would have remained exactly what it is, and would have lost no part of its deepest foundation, if it had pleased God to leave us only the Apostolic preaching, as it lies before us in the Epistles of the New Testament, and together with the Gospels to deprive us of all sources out of which we could design for ourselves a detailed picture of the earthly life of Jesus.[1] But he at once adds that of course any man who has attained to faith in Christ's Person and work by reason of the Apostolic preaching as both are there represented, will certainly not at the outset assume that the picture of His historical life which the Apostles conceived, and which Paul formed of the same, can have been one thoroughly mistaken, dimmed by subjective presuppositions, or that the Gospels retained by us as the sole sources for our information of that life have preserved what is only a falsified picture, whether this be the fault of that earliest tradition, or a consequence of their distance from it.[2]

But if we would fairly realise the point of view of the Apostolic preaching, this can only be done, according to Dr. Weiss, by remembering that the narratives which it introduces are not meant to gratify curiosity, or to serve the purposes of historical investigation ; they were meant to strengthen and quicken faith, to edify in the widest possible

[1] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 15. [2] *Ibid.*

sense, and they were, therefore, confined to the public life of Jesus, of which the disciples had been witnesses, and in which He had gained His significance for the people. But if this was their purpose, then Dr. Weiss thinks that in such preaching, and in the Apostolic letters, inquiries into the history of the Saviour's childhood or youth were plainly excluded, and we can understand how it is that no reference is made to His miraculous birth.[1]

It is, however, important to notice that no one has emphasised the fact more strongly than Dr. Weiss himself, that although the Apostolic letters, which aimed at the formation of the religious and moral life of the Church, scarcely enter upon the details of the life of Jesus, it is by no means to be taken for granted—although the conclusion has been strangely drawn—that the eye-witnesses of that life had no motive or occasion to testify of what they had seen and heard in the society of their Master. In the different assemblies of Messianic believers there would be continual reference to the recollections of the life of Jesus, in whose name men had associated themselves together as a distinct society within the great community of their nation, and here most naturally would the words of Jesus be recalled for teaching and warning, for strength and consolation.[2]

But confining our attention to St. Paul, we find that Dr. Weiss is careful to point out that during the Apostle's visit to Peter in Jerusalem, he no doubt asked and was told many things respecting the Lord's life on earth, and that he is able to appeal repeatedly to the words of the Lord for his statements and directions, although this appeal is made, not to written Gospels, but to oral tradition (1 Cor. xv. 3, &c.).[3] Elsewhere we gain much fuller information of the extent of the Apostle's knowledge, as it is revealed to us in his Epistles.

It might appear at first sight as if this information

[1] *Leben Jesu*, i. 13 and 16.

[2] *Leben Jesu*, i. 15, 16. See below, chap. v, for the application of this argument to the position of St. Paul, as well as to that of the first disciples, and for a proof of how much was involved in the statement that Jesus was the Christ.

[3] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 119 and 22–4.

amounted to very little, even when it is given in detail. Paul only mentions, it would seem, those points in the historical life of Christ which were doctrinally significant, viz. His lineage, the institution of the Lord's Supper, His death and resurrection. He did not look up, like the first Apostles, from the picture of the earthly life of Jesus which they had themselves seen, to the divine glory of the Ascended Lord, but he looked back, from the splendour in which Christ had appeared to Him, upon His earthly life; whatever he may have seen or heard of this latter, his representation of the Christ was at any rate not conditioned by it. There is no trace in his Epistles of any details which are not closely connected with the teaching and work of Christ. That He was descended from Abraham and the fathers (Gal. iii. 16; Rom. ix. 5), and, specifically, that He was of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3, cf. Acts xiii. 23)—these were facts of which the Apostle possessed historical information; but he only uses them to justify the references of both prophetical and patriarchal prophecies of the Messiah to the Christ whom he preached.[1]

Passing to the other two facts, the death and resurrection, which formed the foundation of the Apostle's preaching, it would certainly seem that he must have been in possession of a considerable amount of information relating to them, even if we accept the limits of that information which Dr. Weiss proposes. He knew, *e.g.*, that Jesus was slain upon the cross at the time of the Passover (1 Cor. v. 7; Gal. ii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 13; Rom. vi. 6), by the Jewish and heathen rulers (1 Cor. ii. 8)—all this may be allowed—although we cannot conclude from Gal. iii. 1, that the Apostle had related to his Churches every detail of the death of Christ. He speaks of the sufferings of Christ (2 Cor. i. 5, 7, cf. Phil. iii. 19, Col. i. 24); but because he illustrates them for his readers by a reference to Psalm lxix. 10, it is evident how few of the details of these sufferings were vividly before his eyes.[2] That he knows how Christ had instituted the Lord's Supper on the night in which He was

[1] Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 289, 5. Aufl. 1888.
[2] Weiss, *ibid.* pp. 289, 290.

betrayed into the hands of His enemies, only shows, Dr. Weiss thinks, that he had had explained to him the origin of a custom which he had found in the Christian Church; moreover, the historical details are subordinated to the Apostle's teaching as to the meaning of the Supper, and he himself refers this teaching to a higher source (1 Cor. xi. 23-25).[1]

With regard to the Resurrection, Paul appeals to the same facts as the first Apostles, and to the particular appearances of Christ vouchsafed to them and the oldest disciples (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4, and v. 11). And we may notice that Dr. Weiss points out how the Apostle repeatedly emphasises the burial of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4, cf. Acts xiii. 29; Col. ii. 12) as a guarantee of the reality of His death and of His resurrection, and therefore alike important in its relation to both these great facts of salvation.[2]

If we turn to the manner in which Paul represents the sinless purity of Jesus and the example which He left for imitation, we see a further distinction between his teaching and that of the first Apostles: the latter was evidently based upon the direct impression of the life and sufferings of the historical Christ. With Paul it is otherwise: only once is the sinlessness of Jesus expressed, and that in quite a dogmatic manner (2 Cor. v. 21); but Dr. Weiss suggests a reason for this inasmuch as Paul had no necessity to prove historically the sinlessness which was self-evident in the case of the Messiah exalted to heaven, who by His death had redeemed the world from sin.[3]

But if we put together the few references which Dr. Weiss admits, it is by no means evident that Paul was unacquainted with the leading traits in the character of Jesus. Thus the Apostle mentions His meekness and gentleness: in his own self-forgetful striving after the salvation of others, he is an imitator of Christ, and points to the proof of love which He had given in His death; so that he bids the Thessalonians to be imitators of the joy which the Lord had shown in His sufferings (1 Thess. i. 6).[4]

[1] *Ubi supra*, p. 290. [2] *Ibid.* p. 290, note. [3] *Ibid.* p. 290.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 290. In the 5th edit. of his *Bibl. Theol.* (in contrast with earlier

Certainly it seems strange to Dr. Weiss that the Apostle instead of making manifest that unselfish surrender of Christ by some special feature of His life, appeals to the verse of a Psalm ; and he thinks it is still more significant that the Apostle looks back from Christ's earthly life to His pre-existent being, in order to set forth His self-sacrificing love as an example for imitation (2 Cor. viii. 9 ; cf. Phil. ii. 5).[1] But in the first place, nothing was more natural than that St. Paul should fix upon the death of Christ as the great act of His life in which all His self-sacrifice reached its highest and culminating point, and, in the next place, it must always be remembered that the two last passages (2 Cor. viii. 9 and Phil. ii. 5) by no means exclude all reference to the condition of the earthly life of Jesus.

But this sinless purity of Jesus, and its acknowledgment by St. Paul, must also be regarded from another point of view. In an important passage Dr. Weiss maintains that we cannot discover whether Paul really considered how this sinlessness of Christ in His earthly life agreed with his teaching as to the reign of sin over all mankind through the transgression of Adam. Does not such teaching demand in the case of the one sinless man a direct act of divine creation ? Whether Paul drew what Dr. Weiss calls this almost indispensable consequence for his system we do not, in Dr. Weiss's opinion, know, since we have to set on the other side the facts that in Gal. iv. 4 the Apostle speaks of Christ being born of a woman without intimating that there was anything unusual in His birth ; that in Rom. i. 3, he plainly stamps Him to be of the seed of David ; and that we cannot presuppose that he was ever acquainted with the tradition in our Gospels of the miraculous conception of Jesus.[2]

But at the same time we are warned that it is going too far to affirm on the strength of such passages that the Apostle denied the supernatural birth, since even the Evangelists who narrate the miracle of Christ's supernatural conception do not

editions) Dr. Weiss seems inclined to limit the reference to the meekness and gentleness of Christ to the Passion.

[1] *Ubi supra*, p. 290.

[2] *Ibid.* pp. 290, 291.

regard it as a reason for excluding His genealogical descent from the fathers.[1]

In the face of such frequent qualifications, it is almost surprising to find how much Dr. Weiss implies as to St. Paul's knowledge of the Christ of the Gospels. In his opinion, although the Apostle did not enjoy personal intercourse with Christ, it is possible that he may have seen Him at Jerusalem, little as this can be proved from 2 Cor. v. 16; it is possible, too, that the attack of Jesus upon the Pharisees prepossessed him from the very beginning against the Nazarene; and that he anticipated his companions in his conviction of the danger which threatened the law of the fathers.[2]

Whilst, however, it cannot be maintained that Jesus during His earthly lifetime exercised any important influence upon Paul, the future Apostle would naturally have heard in his disputations with the followers of the Crucified how His death and resurrection were 'according to the Scriptures' (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4), and in the same way he may have gained a knowledge of many incidents of His earthly life. But all attempts to derive the source of Paul's Gospel from the thoughts which may thus have been stirred in his breast are, Dr. Weiss maintains, in direct contradiction to the Apostle's own testimony in Gal. i., where his aim is to show that his whole attitude towards the religion of Jesus before the event at Damascus (verse 13) excluded all possibility of human influence in the formation of his Gospel (verses 11, 12); and the Apostle's gaze was fixed first of all, not upon the Jewish Messiah, but upon the Mediator of divine grace for sinners aroused to a consciousness of their sins.[3]

But whilst Dr. Weiss thus attaches the greatest importance to Paul's own statement in Gal. i., he none the less condemns the opinion which supposes that from the commencement Paul was freed from the primitive traditional teaching of the Church. It is true that the Apostle rarely quotes the decision of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11, ix. 14; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15), but, as Weiss expressly admits, the frequent reminiscences of them in his writings show that many other words of Jesus were

[1] *Ubi supra*, pp. 290, 291, note 3. [2] *Ibid.* p. 199, note. [3] *Ibid.* p. 199.

known to him. If, moreover, he did not at first come into contact with the Apostles, he was not from the commencement of his career so isolated from intercourse with the Christian community that the current ideas and teachings should not have been known to him, nor does it follow from Gal. i. 11, 12 that the Apostle did not adhere in many respects in his preaching to the views and doctrines within the primitive Christian circle with which without reserve he considered himself in union. The very fact that the Church praised God because St. Paul now preached the faith which once he destroyed shows how fully and entirely they regarded him as one of themselves.[1]

No doubt when Paul's special mission directed him more and more exclusively to the heathen, there must have been peculiar features in his doctrinal teaching wherein it differed from that which existed in circles of Jewish Christians.[2]

But when we thus consider at length the view which Dr. Weiss entertains of St. Paul's relation to the historical Christ, we may see in it a justification of his own remark that a knowledge which the Apostle had gained according to revelation (Gal. i. 16) in no way excludes a knowledge according to tradition.[3]

In the note in which Dr. Weiss thus expresses himself he mentions another writer who has rightly drawn attention to this twofold source of St. Paul's knowledge—Paret by name—although he thinks that this writer has over-estimated the extent of the details of the life of Jesus which Paul announced in his fundamental preaching.

The name of Heinrich Paret is but little known in England in comparison with the names of the representative writers to whom reference has already been made, but he has examined more fully than any of them the relation of St. Paul to the historical Christ. In his treatment of the subject Paret

[1] *Ubi supra*, p. 200. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] 'Mit Recht hat Paret (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1858) darauf aufmerksam gemacht, dass der offenbarungsmässige Ursprung seiner Vorstellung von Christo, dessen sich Paulus bewusst war (Gal. i. 16), keineswegs eine überlieferungsmässige Kunde von Christo ausschliesst; aber den Umfang dessen, was Paulus von Details aus dem Leben Jesu in seiner grundlegenden Predigt verkündigte, hat Paret sicher überschätzt' (Weiss, *Lehrbuch der B. T.* p. 289, note 1).

not only shows that St. Paul's acquaintance with the earthly life of our Lord is much fuller than has often been supposed, but he also tries to meet difficulties which must present themselves in connection with the Pauline testimony: viz. (1) Why does the Apostle quote so seldom from our Lord's words and apparently refer to so few of His deeds? and (2) From what sources did the Apostle derive the amount of information which he possessed. Paret's contributions first appeared in the 'Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie,' 1858, 1859, but references are made to them by Dr. Weiss in his recent 'Introduction,' and although, as we have seen, he expresses his opinion elsewhere that Paret has made too much of some of his details, he refers to the earlier article of 1858 as an authority for the sources of St. Paul's information ('Einleitung,' p. 119), and to the later article of 1859, with which his own view is in substantial agreement, as an authority upon the nature of the appearance of the Risen Lord which was vouchsafed to the Apostle ('Einleitung,' pp. 115, 116).

But an acknowledgment of Paret's work is by no means confined to one distinguished writer. 'Paul,' writes Keim, 'is correctly estimated in the excellent treatise of Paret, "Paulus und Jesus" (1858).'[1] And the context makes it evident that Keim is referring, not merely to the way in which the Apostle is represented as dealing with historical facts, but to Paret's enumeration of the facts.

If Paret's life had been spared, there is every reason to believe that he would have found a place in the front rank of German theologians. In proof of this we need only to refer to the warm eulogy passed upon him by Weizsäcker, and to the extract which he gives from one of Paret's letters, written in the near approach of death, and from which we gain some idea of the beauty and simplicity of a life cut short in the prime of manhood.[2]

When we find that such well-known writers as Hase, Keim, W. Grimm, Meyer, Hagenbach, Reuss, Weizsäcker,

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 36, note.

[2] *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1859, pp. 252–4. In these pages we see how highly Weizsäcker ranks Paret's studies on Josephus, to which reference is also made by Keim (*Geschichte Jesu*, i. 10, 12, 14).

Mangold, B. Weiss, and more recently Resch and P. Ewald, all refer to Paret's treatise on the relation of St. Paul to the historical Jesus, there seems to be ample justification for directing attention to it so frequently in the following pages.[1] It is also evident that Paret's work has been appreciated in France, as we can easily see by a close comparison of it with many passages in Sabatier's 'L'Apôtre Paul'—indeed, Sabatier distinctly refers to it in estimating Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus.[2]

Another French writer to whom attention is called by Reuss, J. H. Huraut, has also evidently made acquaintance with Paret's articles, and has enriched the subject with many criticisms of weight and value in his own treatise ('Paul, a-t-il connu le Christ historique?'[3]

But fifteen years before Paret wrote, a letter of much interest was addressed by Otto Thenius to Bruno Bauer (1843). Its title is suggestive, 'The Gospel without the Gospels,'[4] and the writer's argument is very similar to that contained in many modern apologetic works of English

[1] Hase, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 31, 10. Aufl.; W. Grimm, *Lexicon in Libros N. T.* p. 336, 2. Aufl.; Meyer, *Korintherbriefe*, i. 419 (reference to Paret's second treatise); Hagenbach, *Encyklopädie der theologischen Wissenschaften*, p. 221, 10. Aufl.; Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 55, 56 (to Paret's second treatise), and again p. 163, 6. Aufl.; Mangold, in 4th edit. of Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 477, note; B. Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 289, 5. Aufl.; *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 115 (to second treatise), and p. 119, 2. Aufl.; Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 171, 1889; P. Ewald, *Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 75, 1890.

[2] Frequent references (see *Index*) will be found to Sabatier's work, especially in connection with Paul's extensive knowledge of the life and teaching of Jesus (chap. v., comp. *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 57–64).

[3] This treatise, published in 1860, to which references are frequently made in these pages, was kindly lent to the writer by the author, M. le pasteur Huraut, of the University of Montauban. He is mentioned by Reuss in his *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* in earlier editions, and also in the latest (cf. 6. Aufl. p. 55), in combination with two other writers, Paret and Thenius.

[4] *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien.* Thenius is also known by his work on St. John's Gospel which he called *Das Evangelium der Evangelien* (1865), 'The Gospel of Gospels.' Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 618. A copy of his letter to Bruno Bauer can be studied at the British Museum. See also an interesting reference made to him by Sir William Dawson, F.R.S., in *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, p. 517. For other recent references to Thenius and his work mentioned in the text, see Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. p. 70, 1887, and Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 22, 1891.

writers. His aim is to furnish a representation of the life of Jesus out of the Epistles of the New Testament as if the Gospels did not exist; and he claims to be the first to have given such a complete list of the points of contact between the Epistles and the Gospels (pp. 53, 77, 78). And this list, he reminds us, is taken from the Epistles which are admitted to be genuine, while all other quotations from disputed writings of the New Testament are enclosed in brackets.

But the letter of Thenius is of further interest, because it anticipates to some extent[1] and refutes the position taken up by more recent German critics, notably Pfleiderer, as to the mutual relations of the Gospels and the Epistles. If their judgment is correct, the Epistles are not merely prior to the Gospels, but they contain the groundwork of the narratives afterwards elaborated in the Gospels, which, otherwise, would not have been written at all.

To take one or two examples. In St. Paul's words in Romans i. 4, where he speaks of Jesus Christ as 'declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness,' we are said to have the kernel of St. Luke's story of the Annunciation and miraculous conception: 'And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God' (Luke i. 35).[2] So, too, in the Apostle's statement in the previous verse that Jesus Christ 'was made of the seed of David according to the flesh' (Rom. i. 3), we have the germ of the story in Luke ii. which describes the journey of the mother of Jesus, before the birth of her child, to Bethlehem the city of David.[3]

In the same way the Evangelist is supposed to illustrate other expressions of St. Paul. The Apostle, for instance, writes to the Galatians that 'when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law' (Gal. iv. 4, 5). Here we have a series of statements, each one of which is repro-

[1] See especially Thenius, *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, p. 52.
[2] Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, pp. 419-21. [3] *Ibid.* pp. 421-3.

duced in the narrative of St. Luke. The fulness of the time is intimated in the close connection which the Evangelist seeks to establish between the birth of the Saviour of the world and the political events of the Roman empire, and reference has already been made to the way in which God's sending forth His Son, born of a woman, is represented in Luke's story of the Incarnation. But the Evangelist has still to show that the Incarnate Son of God was really 'made under the law,' and that from the beginning the pious in Israel had known by revelation His divine destiny as the Redeemer of heathen and Jew alike, together with the opposition which He would provoke, and the suffering which awaited Him. And this task he has accomplished in the narratives of the Circumcision of Jesus, of His Presentation in the Temple, and in the oracular sayings and blessings placed in the mouth of a Simeon and an Anna (Luke ii. 21–38).[1]

In a similar manner Pfleiderer deals with other events of our Lord's life. Thus, according to him, nothing can be plainer than that the story of the Transfiguration is based upon such passages as 2 Cor. iii. and iv. 6 (although for many of its details it depends upon Old Testament legend), and the disappearance of Moses and Elias, leaving Jesus alone with His disciples, is meant to show how the highest glory of the old covenant is but transient, and vanishes before the abiding glory of the Lord who is the Spirit.[2]

But Pfleiderer's position, which makes Luke the chief agent in translating Paul's brief statements into the stories which surround the birth and early years of Jesus, had been already anticipated by Gustav Volkmar. The results arrived at by Volkmar are remarkable, because whilst he occupies the position of the early Tübingen school in accepting the four great Pauline Epistles, and the early date of the Apocalypse, and in some respects surpasses even Baur in daring, he places the Gospel of St. Mark three years after the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 73.[3]

[1] *Urchristenthum*, pp. 423, 424, 481.
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 388, 389, and *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 175–7.
[3] Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 18, 19 (1882).

But, according to Volkmar, the Gospel of St. Luke must be placed much later, at the beginning of the second century and that of St. Matthew later still.[1] The belief in the miraculous birth of Jesus, current in the opening years of this century, naturally turned men's thoughts to the contemplation of His early life. Here was the opportunity for the poetic genius of the Pauline Luke. Paul had already published his own history of the early years of Jesus, but it was contained in one brief statement, Gal. iv. 4. But, for Luke this passage does not stand alone. The Apostle had spoken to the Corinthians of the grace of the Lord Jesus, 'who, though he was rich, yet for our sakes became poor' (2 Cor. viii. 9). And so in Luke's narrative of the Incarnation, we see how the Son of God passes from the riches of His divine being into the poverty of time; how all the circumstances of a human life of poverty are known to Him, its need, its want, its lowliness; how Christianity is cradled in the manger of the poor shepherds.[2] And the Son of God, who thus comes, comes 'under the law': (*a*) as the destined Messiah of Israel He is born of the family, and in Bethlehem, the town, of David (Luke ii. 1–7); (*b*) under the law of circumcision (Luke ii. 21); (*c*) under the law of offerings, when 'according to the law of Moses,' He is presented in the Temple (Luke ii. 22–40); (*d*) under the law, in his visit to the Temple at the age of twelve, in fulfilment of the obligation binding upon every Jewish boy (Luke ii. 41–52).[3] But if so much is involved in the simple statement 'made under the law,' we are surely justified in believing that St. Paul's use of the phrase carries with it no slight acquaintance with the incidents of the early life of Jesus, and Volkmar helps us to understand how much may underlie the brief words of the Apostle.[4]

[1] *Ubi supra*, pp. 20, 21. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 46–8. [3] *Ibid.* p. 48.

[4] Compare Matheson's argument in connection with the very same phrase in *The Historical Christ of St. Paul.*

Just as the Pauline Luke is said to graft his stories upon such a passage as Gal. iv. 4, so Volkmar argues that the Jewish Christian 'Matthew' found the basis of the second chapter of his Gospel in the statements contained in the Apocalypse, ch. xii. 1–5, and xxi. 23, 24, combined with familiar Old Testament prophecies. But in Volkmar's view the whole account of the flight into Egypt and the visit of the Magi is not fact, but poetry, the author's way of expressing in figurative

But the curious connection between the Epistles and the Gospels, which is thus advocated by Pfleiderer and Volkmar, is by no means confined to the events of our Lord's life ; it is extended to His words narrated by the Evangelists, the origin of which may often be traced to the Epistles. There are passages in each of the first three Gospels to which Pfleiderer refers in support of his theory, and it will be sufficient to give one or two instances from each of these Gospels.

We read in Mark viii. 34, that Jesus demands of His disciples that they should take up their cross and follow Him. Such a demand, according to Pfleiderer, could only have been placed in the mouth of Jesus after His death upon the cross had really happened, and its source is to be found in the specifically Pauline thought that believers shared in the death of the crucified Jesus (Gal. ii. 19, vi. 14). In the words which follow, relating to the losing and saving of the soul, we may have an original utterance of Jesus, but here, too, in Pfleiderer's opinion, there is a reminiscence of such expressions as those contained in Gal. ii. 20. But in the following verses he finds unmistakable reminiscences of the Epistles to the Romans and Philippians. To gain the world, and to lose one's own soul, is the same contrast which is expressed in the very same words, although in a somewhat different connection (*κερδῆσαι, ζημιωθῆναι*), in Phil. iii. 7, 8. The thought of a price paid for the soul (Mark viii. 37) forms a fundamental conception in the

language the early history of Christianity, its dangers and its triumphs (*Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 49–52). But may we not rather argue that the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse manifestly borrows its colouring from the birth of Jesus and Herod's seeking the young Child's life? If so, such incidents must have been already well known when the Apocalypse was written, and Volkmar is one of those who assign it to the early date 68–9 A.D. (cf. *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 21, Bishop of Derry). It is surely more antecedently probable that the imagery of Rev. xii. is a reminiscence of the events described in Matt. iii. than that the circumstantial narrative of the Evangelist was derived from such imagery.

Pfleiderer seeks to explain in a similar manner the same narratives in the Gospel according to Matthew out of the Apocalypse, Luke, and the Old Testament. Chap. xii. and chap. xxi. 24 of the Apocalypse are similarly introduced as the basis of the narratives of the visit of the Magi and the flight into Egypt, whilst the incident of Herod's wrath in slaying the children of Bethlehem is founded upon chap. xii. 17 (*Urchristenthum*, pp. 481–5). Pfleiderer agrees with Volkmar in placing Luke at the commencement of the second century, and Matthew later still (p. 542).

Pauline doctrine of redemption, according to which we are ransomed and bought with a price (Gal. iii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 20). The being ashamed of Christ and His words in this adulterous and sinful generation (Mark viii. 38) is a reminiscence of Rom. i. 16, and probably the designation 'this adulterous generation' is best explained by believing that the writer had in mind the detailed representation of the sins of impurity which Paul gives us in the same portion of his Epistle to the Romans.[1]

We pass to an instance in St. Luke, where Pfleiderer finds a similarly close connection, and even verbal agreement. After the return of the seventy—an incident in which Pfleiderer only sees a typical representation of the Pauline mission to the heathen[2]—Christ is represented as giving thanks that the Father had hidden these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes (Luke x. 21). Here Pfleiderer has no doubt that the Evangelist directly refers to 1 Cor. i. 19–25, and ii. 7–16, and he endeavours to prove, not merely a similarity of thought, but a close verbal agreement. In the same manner Luke x. 22 is unmistakably derived from 1 Cor. ii. 7, 2 Cor. iii. 5, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 27.[3] And if we seek an instance from St. Matthew of the same line of argument, we may take as a sample the confession of Peter in xvi. 17. In the words 'flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven,' there is a reference to Gal. i. 12 and 16, where Paul declares that he conferred not with flesh and blood, when it pleased God to reveal His Son in him.[4]

[1] *Urchristenthum*, p. 384.

[2] *Urchristenthum*, pp. 442, 444. Pfleiderer of course argues that the expressions in Luke x. 7, 8, are direct quotations from 1 Cor. ix. 14 and x. 27, and presuppose the conditions of heathen-Christian life (p. 444).

Urchristenthum, p. 445, note. 'Die Berührung unserer Stelle mit den Gedanken und Worten von 1 Cor. i. 19–iii. 1 ist so auffallend (vgl. σοφοὶ, συνετοὶ, μωροὶ, νήπιοι, σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ ἀποκεκρυμμένην, ἀπεκάλυψεν, εὐδόκησεν, οὐκ ἔγνω, οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν), dass ich an direkter Beziehung des Evangelisten auf jene Stelle nicht zweifeln kann.' So, too, in relation to v. 22: 'Bei der wahrscheinlich älteren Lesart ἔγνω ist die Beziehung auf das mehrfache οὐκ ἔγνω, οὐδεὶς ἔγνωκεν, τίς ἔγνω, εἰ ἔγνωσαν, in 1 Cor. i. 21, ii. 8, ii. 16 noch augenfälliger.'

[4] *Urchristenthum*, p. 518. According to Pfleiderer, the expression in Matt. v. 19, 'the *least* in the kingdom of heaven' (ἐλάχιστος), undoubtedly refers to Paul, who had called himself 'the *least* of the Apostles' (ἐλάχιστος), 1 Cor. xv. 9 (*Urchristenthum*, p. 495, and *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 178, 179).

But if Pfleiderer's statements are correct, we are carried far beyond the position of those who credit St. Paul with the creation of Christian dogmas out of the simple facts of the Gospel history—here, St. Paul not only creates the dogmas, but the facts, or at least the basis of them.

Moreover, if this theory is correct, then it is plain that the authors of the Gospels are more wonderful than the events they narrate. They not only more than justify the opinion which Pfleiderer and Volkmar enforce as to their poetic genius, but they are unrivalled in their art, and they possess, in addition, the marvellous power of inventing some of those sayings of Jesus which (Keim being witness) are marked, in every sentence, with such a peculiar mental stamp that no successor, no Evangelist, Jew or Gentile, not even Paul himself, could have invented them.[1] In Renan's opinion the Gospel of Luke is the most beautiful book which was ever written, and the first two chapters call forth his special praise. But if the theory which we are examining is correct, a very considerable portion of St. Luke's opening narrative must have been composed from a few scattered hints in the Epistles of St. Paul.[2]

[1] 'Die Reden Jesu insbesondere tragen neben den Zeitspuren aller Zeichen einer hohen geschlossenen Originalität, einer grossmächtigen Natur, einer göttlichen Weihe und Kraft, so sehr, dass selbst das einzelne Wort, voll alterthümlicher, in der Kirche bald verlorener Gewandung, den Stempel eines Geistes trägt, den kein Epigone, kein Evangelist, Jude oder Heide, und auch kein Paul zu erfinden wusste' (Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. 64; cf. Holtzmann, in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 15).

We may compare with these words of Keim the well-known judgment of J. S. Mill, *Three Essays on Religion*, pp. 253, 254.

The following extract from a review of Pfleiderer's book in the *Spectator* of January 12, 1889, will be of interest. 'What wonderful people these Evangelists must have been, to take a doctrinal statement or an Old Testament prophecy and weave it into a lifelike story which shall be taken by many generations for historical truth! If this were possible, then the greatest poets are not Homer nor Shakespeare, but the Evangelists. Seriously, however, is not this kind of work the *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory? Where did Paul get his facts, or his beliefs, about the life of Christ? Is it not simpler, more historical, more likely, that the resemblance between the facts of the Gospels and the ideas of Paul is to be explained by the priority of the former—that Paul's conceptions were ruled by the facts, not *vice versa*?'

[2] Renan, *Les Evangiles*, p. 278. Cf. also Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* p. 58.

But one thing may at all events be noted, that whether the Evangelists are indebted to St. Paul or not, it is evident, on Pfleiderer's own showing, that a very close similarity exists between the Gospels and the Epistles; and the more frequently Pfleiderer and others insist upon this similarity, the more clearly are we enabled to see that 'the Epistles are also Gospels.' Indeed, Pfleiderer's book might not unfairly be used as a help to the argument of Chapters iv.–viii. below; and whilst we cannot always endorse the references which, in his eagerness to support his own theory, he is for ever finding *in* the Gospels *to* the Epistles, yet such points of contact may help to strengthen our belief that throughout these Epistles we are breathing the atmosphere, if not of the very words, yet at least of the thoughts and the mind of the Jesus of the Gospels.[1]

Part II

In the same year in which Pfleiderer delivered the Hibbert Lectures, another German writer, W. Beyschlag, published the first edition of his 'Leben Jesu' (2nd edit. 1887). Beyschlag's name is one full of interest in connection with our present inquiry, not only on account of his views as to our Lord's pre-existence, Incarnation, and Ascension, and his well-known articles in the 'Studien und Kritiken' in defence of Paul against the visionary theories of Baur and Holsten, but also on account of his valuable references in his 'Leben Jesu' to Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ. It is, moreover, important to remember that P. Ewald in his work to which the most recent criticism on the Synoptic Question has drawn our attention in England, 'Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage,' makes special reference to Beyschlag's 'Leben Jesu' in support of his assertion that Paul was doubtless acquainted with the material of the Gospel history, and

[1] Comp. P. Ewald's criticism on Holtzmann's theory of the dependence of the fourth Gospel upon the Pauline Epistles, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, pp. 89, 91, 93.

especially with the discourses of Jesus.[1] Beyschlag, in discussing the extra-evangelical witnesses to the facts of the life of Jesus, points out that not a few of the New Testament writings are older than our Gospels, and are partly so undisputed in the circumstances of their origin that what they declare or permit us to know of the facts concerning Jesus can claim the highest value of historical testimony. At first sight, he admits that one who would look at these Epistles would be overcome by a feeling of disappointment, that they do not contain more frequent references to the life of Jesus, and especially, more frequent quotations of His words. But if so, as Beyschlag reminds us, we should thus overlook the fact that all these Epistles, together with the Apocalypse, are directed to Churches which had already received at their institution firmly established notices of Jesus, as a foundation of their belief, and are therefore only from time to time reminded of them upon special occasions: in the same way that the whole Apostolic preaching tended to take for its text, not so much particular incidents of the teaching and life of Jesus, but rather that life viewed as a whole, and especially the last act of it. If we regard it from this point of view, Beyschlag holds that the witness concerning Jesus contained in the contemporary writings of the New Testament, quite apart from the Gospels, is full and weighty. After speaking of the valuable testimony derived from the Epistles of James and 1 Peter, both of which Beyschlag accepts as genuine, and assigns to a very early date, he passes to the consideration of the writings of the Apostle Paul. From these, and especially from the Apostle's great Epistles, which he speaks of as raised above all critical opposition, Beyschlag points out that we obtain the richest number of references to the earthly life of Jesus. How profoundly, he observes, has this Paul, one of the most powerfully intellectual of men who have ever lived, this Apostle of the Gentiles, standing in the clearest light of history, bowed before Jesus! how does this Contemporary, belonging to the same people, appear to him in the light of eternity!

[1] *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 75, 1890. See Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. pp. 61 ff.

Jesus is for him 'the second Adam,' the spiritual and heavenly man, who, just as all owed their material life to the first Adam, has become for all men the source of a higher and divine life, the higher and completing regeneration of humanity, who restores it to its divine idea and eternal destination (Rom. v. 12; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45–49). Moreover, in these conceptions Paul includes the idea of an intervention in the creation of the world: this prototype of humanity is also the image of the invisible God, the essential divine idea, upon which the whole creation of the world is based (1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15). It is impossible, Beyschlag argues that all this lofty Christology could have been derived chiefly from the appearance of Christ at Damascus, which caused the Apostle's conversion, without any impression from the historical life of Jesus co-operating with it; as if that appearance which had only assured Paul of the Messiahship of Jesus, of His life in glory, and of His pity in seeking for him, could possibly have produced the fulness of the Apostle's Christological ideas without the historical revelation of God in Christ! The central point of the salvation which had appeared in Christ is not fixed for Paul in His exaltation, of which the Apostle had been certified in the appearance vouchsafed to him before Damascus, but in His voluntary self-humiliation even to the cross, and this conclusion of the historico-earthly life of the Saviour presupposes, with regard to the significance of His salvation, the entire religious and moral contents and character of that earthly life, and at the same time Paul's full appreciation of it (as also Keim acknowledges, vol. i. pp. 35–44).

To obtain this, as Beyschlag proceeds to point out, historical means of help were by no means wanting to Paul, although he had not belonged to the personal disciples of Jesus. Whether the years of his life which Paul spent in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel coincided with the critical days of the life of Jesus, or followed immediately upon them, at any rate the learned circles of the capital were full at that time of the events by which Jesus had stirred the people to the inmost depths of their souls; and the hostile and persecuting attitude

which the young Saul assumed above all his companions cannot possibly be conceived of, unless, with thoroughness and set purpose, he had acquired information about the man whose appearance had aroused such a violent contest. The miracle of his conversion only placed the historical knowledge already possessed by Paul in a new light, a light which only disclosed to him the inward knowledge of that which he had already known well in outward appearance (2 Cor. v. 16); and in so far as the external knowledge was still in need of completion, it was supplemented from the most reliable sources by Paul's familiar intercourse with an Ananias and a Barnabas, and in a further degree by his intercourse with Peter, and James the brother of the Lord (comp. Acts ix; Gal. i. 18, 19, ii. 1, 6). Accordingly Paul, when he had newly founded a Church, painted Christ before their eyes, as if He were crucified in their very midst, and before all other means he laid 'the one foundation' by the aid of rich historical communications (1 Cor. xi. 23, xv, 1). If, therefore, in the Epistles written to already existing Churches, he only refers in an exceptional manner to those historical foundations, he nevertheless shows by this very circumstance from what a rich supply he derives them.

Thus, he knows that Jesus 'is descended from the seed of David according to the flesh' (Rom. i. 3); that He 'became poor for our sakes, that we through his poverty might be made rich' (2 Cor. viii. 9); that He did not live to please Himself, but allowed the reproaches of the enemies of God to fall upon Himself (Rom. xv. 3); that He 'knew no sin,' and out of love for us voluntarily went to His death, the accursed death of the cross (2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. v. 6; Gal. ii. 20, iii. 13). Although he rarely quoted sayings of Jesus, yet he knows, *e.g.*, what Jesus had expressed with regard to marriage and what not (1 Cor. vii. 10 and 25), so that he thus possessed at all events a fair general view of the sayings of the Lord. He has also referred (1 Cor. ix. 14) to the saying that 'the labourer [in the gospel] is worthy of his meat' (*i.e.* of his livelihood) (Matt. x. 10); and so too, as it appears, in 1 Thess. 14, 15, to words of Jesus concerning the resurrection of the dead, and in Acts xx. 35,

in one of the most undoubtedly authentic portions of the Acts, he introduces a saying of Jesus, which not even our Evangelists have retained, while it certainly bears the stamp of genuineness: *It is more blessed to give than to receive.* The miracles of Jesus he does not expressly mention; but if he repeatedly mentions the gifts of miracles and healing present in his Churches (1 Cor. xii. 28; Gal. iii. 5); if he appeals to the 'signs, mighty works, and miracles' which he had himself performed as to the 'signs of an Apostle' (Rom. xv. 18, 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12), and is confident every moment that 'in the name of Jesus Christ' he has power to perform even miracles of punishment (1 Cor. v. 4, 5; 2 Cor. xii. 21–xiii. 10)—from whence could he have derived this confidence in his own miraculous working, or in that abundant gift of miracles possessed by the early Church, except from the miraculous prototype of Jesus?

But Beyschlag has not yet mentioned what he terms the two most important communications concerning the life of Jesus which Paul gives us, and which we find in the Apostle's most undisputed letters, viz. the institution of the Lord's Supper, and the history of the Resurrection. In 1 Cor. xi. certain disorders at the Corinthian Love Feasts lead him to mention the institution of the Lord's Supper, and he gives a report of it, says Beyschlag, in express correspondence with that of the Evangelists, attests 'the night of the betrayal,' corroborates the connection of the last supper of Jesus with the custom of the Passover meal by the mention of the 'breaking of the bread' and in the designation of the cup as 'a cup of blessing,' introduces the words of institution more fully than any of the Evangelists and transfers us by means of them 'into the soul of Jesus' during the last crisis of His life. In the same manner, continues Beyschlag, in 1 Cor. xv. a doubt which had entered into the Church with regard to the resurrection of the dead leads the Apostle to speak of the resurrection of Jesus, and to show himself more fully instructed concerning it than our first three Evangelists. He recounts in a series the appearances of the Risen One to those who became the chief witnesses of the gospel, a series which materially supplements the reports

contained in the Gospels, and he confirms therein the most important particulars of the great fact of the Resurrection, he connects the appearances of the Risen Jesus with His grave, and dates their commencement from the third day.

The information with regard to our subject which we have thus already gained, quite apart from the Gospels, Beyschlag describes as embracing a small compass, but yet very important in its contents. If, he continues, the aberration of a self-destructive criticism has gone so far as even to deny the historical existence of Jesus, and to relegate the whole tradition concerning Him to the misty Jewish Messianic idea shaped into sham history, or to refer its origin to the picture of the ideal wise and righteous man drawn by the Stoics (comp., *e.g.*, Marius, 'The Personality of Jesus Christ'[1]) it suffices in refutation of this learned folly to remember that the family of Jesus existed in Palestinian Christianity until the time of Domitian (Eusebius, 'C. H.' iii. 19, 20), that a brother of Jesus according to the flesh presided through the succeeding generation over the primitive Church (Gal. ii. 5–12; Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18), and that Paul knew the brethren of Jesus and his first personal disciples (Gal. i. 18, 19; ii. 1 f. 12 f.; 1 Cor. ix. 5). But much more than the mere fact that Jesus lived is guaranteed to us by the witnesses of the first generation: we have a complete sketch of His life, His Davidic descent, His family relations, His forerunner John, the mention of twelve as the number of His disciples (1 Cor. xv. 5), His preaching of the kingdom of heaven and His miracles of healing (Acts x. 36-42; Heb. ii. 3, 4), His claim to be the Messiah, as it appears from the name of 'the Christ' bestowed upon Him by his friends, and frequently used even by those who did not believe in Him, His contest with His own people, especially with the rulers and learned men (1 Cor. ii. 8), His betrayal at night by

[1] Comp. also a curious pamphlet, *Die Weihnachts und Osterfeier erklärt aus dem Sonnencultus der Orientalen*, by F. Nork (1838), for the lengths to which men will go in dealing with the Gospel narratives. The author entitles his work, which was recently re-advertised in Germany, *Etwas für die Besitzer der Strauss-'schen Schrift: 'Das Leben Jesu.'*

one of His disciples (1 Cor. xi. 23; Acts i. 16), the institution of the Lord's Supper, the crucifixion at the Paschal feast (1 Cor. v. 7), the resurrection on the third day. But still more important for us than this external sketch of His life is the fact, adds Beyschlag, that its unique inward character is already made manifest. The Christological views of these first witnesses to the faith are indeed, he notes, not directly historical, but dogmatic expressions, yet an historical fact of the first magnitude is reflected in them—the impression which Jesus made upon His receptive contemporaries and fellow-countrymen, upon men, some of whom were possessed of lofty endowments and conspicuous culture, and all of whom were marked by a deep moral-religious earnestness, who proved their thoughtfulness and love of truth throughout a life rich in contest and sacrifice, full of work and blessing. How, asks Beyschlag, could this impression be otherwise explained than by an overpowering and inward majesty which was more than human, especially in the case of One who in His outward lot differed in no respect from His fellow-nationalists, except in the ignominious fate of a terrible and degrading death? But in addition to this testimony to the impression made by Jesus, there is also, as Beyschlag points out in a concluding and important passage, a direct insight into His inmost heart, furnished to us by the report of the same witnesses whom we have hitherto examined—an insight which in fact already places beyond doubt all upon which belief depends. That Man, he says, who in the night before His death, when He went knowingly and freely to meet His fate, has instituted with such words the holy memorial feast for His followers, He—let one take any position one likes—was beyond doubt conscious that He was presenting in sacrifice a spotless life on behalf of the sinful children of men: He has stood firm in the confidence that He would not be separated from His own by death, but that rather in virtue of His death, He would henceforth be to His followers the meat and drink of their inner life: it is this entirely marvellous and unique self-consciousness of Jesus, His self-consciousness, in one word, that He was the Saviour, which is reflected in the institution of

the Lord's Supper, that most certain fact of all facts which we know of Him.

It is not surprising after this full and striking examination of the witness of the New Testament Epistles to the historical Christ, to find Beyschlag adding that in fact there was ample justification for speaking of a 'Gospel without the Gospels,' when men combined all the testimonies which lie outside the Gospels. Not that Beyschlag depreciates the value of the Gospels; on the contrary, he reminds us that in spite of the value of the witness of the Epistles, the question of the greatest importance must still be that of the origin and trustworthiness of the Gospels, and he cannot endorse the remarks of Dr. B. Weiss to the effect that the Christian faith would remain exactly the same if it had pleased God to leave to us only the Apostolic preaching as it is presented to us in the Epistles of the New Testament; in his view, if we had no authentic Gospels we might perhaps be able to form a general idea of Jesus, but we should have no real living picture of Him, and we should thus be denied the adequate historical means for accounting for the personal impression made by the Saviour.[1]

Amongst still more recent German critics the name of Dr. H. H. Wendt, Professor of Theology in Heidelberg will be already familiar to many English readers by Dr. Sanday's special reference to his 'Lehre Jesu.'[2] This book, which was published in 1881, was followed in 1890 by Dr. Wendt's 'Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu.'

It is interesting to notice the place which Wendt assigns to the Pauline Epistles as sources of information for his subject, and his remarks on pages 10–12 of his later work should be supplemented by the short appendix to the 'Lehre Jesu' on the traditionary sayings of Jesus outside the Gospels.

[1] See, however, for Beyschlag's view of the Gospel narratives of the Incarnation, chap. iv. note, and comp. in answer Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, pp. 109 ff. 1891. Frequent references to this recent work of Nösgen are given in the notes.

[2] *Expositor*, 1891, Feb.–April: 'A Survey of the Synoptic Question.' See also Sept. 1891, for an article on Wendt's later work, by Dr. Iverach.

The sources, he says, for our knowledge of the historical import of the teaching of Jesus do not lie in the reports of the Gospels alone, but also in the literature of the Apostolic age, more especially in the letters of Paul.[1] We have here not only to think of the several quotations of the sayings of Jesus outside the Gospels, but rather of the general fact, that the whole Christian teaching contained in the preaching of the Apostles affords an indirect testimony to the teaching of Jesus. The teaching of the Apostles, and that also of Paul, although he did not belong to the disciples during the lifetime of Jesus, is a product of the powerful influence of His earthly activity. Even if it is certain, as we are now able to recognise, that in the case of the Apostles other factors co-operated in order to produce this result, and, indeed, in the case of Paul in producing it in a form different from that of the original Apostles, yet the Apostles themselves, and more especially Paul, undoubtedly intended not to alter but to continue the gospel of Jesus which they regarded as a revelation. Even their announcement of Jesus as the Messiah was not in their consciousness a new teaching, but only a continuance and completion of the Messianic claim which Jesus Himself had raised. We should thus, even if no direct reports like those of the Gospels had been handed down to us, still possess in this Apostolic literature a valid testimony for the historical existence and the epoch-making significance of the work of Jesus as a teacher. If, therefore, in the criticism of the Gospels one seeks a primary basis for an estimation of their historical trustworthiness, Wendt allows that there is ample justification for taking as such a basis the Pauline Epistles, which constitute the oldest and most solid part of the Apostolic literature, and for attempting in the first place to argue back from these Epistles alone to the actual contents of the conceptions and teaching of Jesus which they presuppose, in order to test by the result the contents of the information afforded us in the Gospels. But at the same time Wendt points out that it would not be correct to employ this method, valid as it is, for a critical

[1] See *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, pp. 10 ff.

inquiry, if it is a question of giving a connected representation of the teaching of Jesus founded upon critically tested sources of information. For the knowledge of the contents of the teaching of Jesus which we are indirectly able to gain from the Pauline Epistles is yet, in comparison with the rich, detailed, and direct communications of the Gospel sources of information, much too general to afford a fitting point of connection for the arrangement and treatment of the whole material communicated to us through the Gospels. Wendt, therefore, determines, for the purpose of his work, only to consider these indirect sources for the teaching of Jesus in this way, viz. to estimate the teaching contained in the Apostolical preaching as the historical result of the teaching of Jesus, and to endeavour to learn the proper significance of that teaching, which his pages present to us on the basis of the Gospel sources of information, from the traces of its powerful influence upon the teaching of the Apostles.

In the Appendix to the 'Lehre Jesu'[1] Wendt remarks at the outset that only very few sayings of Jesus outside the Gospels are handed down to us in such a manner as to justify us in reckoning them as authentic. We have in the first place some words of Jesus vouched for by Paul. In 1 Cor. vii. 10, he introduces the commandment of the Lord, which he expressly discriminates from his own Christian judgment. A saying of Jesus of a similar meaning is handed down to us in the *Logia* of Matthew, and also in the Gospel of Mark (Matt. v. 32 ; Mark x. 5 ; Luke xvi. 18). Paul further remarks (1 Cor. ix. 14) : 'the Lord ordained that those who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.' A similar utterance of Jesus has been preserved for us in the charge of Jesus to His disciples starting on their mission, as that charge is given in the *Logia* of Matthew (Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7). Paul again reports the institution of the Lord's Supper by Jesus and quotes the words of institution. The founding of the same institution is handed down to us by Mark (xiv. 22). Wendt places Mark xiv. 22–24 and 1 Cor. xi. 23–25 in parallel columns and compares the two passages. Besides the minor deviations

[1] Pp. 343 ff.

he draws attention to the fact that Mark only designates the *blood* as having been shed for the benefit of others (*lit.* of the many), whilst Paul makes the analogous statement already when mentioning the body, and that the designation of the cup as the 'blood offering of the covenant' is mentioned in a different way. There is also, he proceeds, the more important deviation, that in place of the invitation to the actual participation (verse 22, 'Take, eat,' &c.) by which Mark introduces the peculiar significance of the offered food, Paul appends to those words which explain the significance of the food a double invitation to the subsequent repetition of this meal as a meal of remembrance (*i.e.* what is given by Mark as a single invitation in the introduction, is given by Paul as a double invitation by way of an *addendum*, or, what occurs in Mark first, occurs in Paul last). A special emphasis is laid by Paul upon this invitation of Jesus, because he is anxious to explain the significance of the repeated feast of the Supper. We are therefore, in Wendt's opinion, justified in assuming that Paul was fully convinced of the authenticity of this invitation given by Jesus, and so the report of Paul may be considered as an important supplement to that of Mark.[1]

Wendt points out that it is interesting to find parallels in the Gospel reports for all those sayings of Jesus which Paul quotes in 1 Cor. There is no occasion whatever, he continues, to consider that we have here a relation of literary dependence of the Gospel reports upon Paul or *vice versâ*; but we also must not suppose that only one fixed form of oral tradition handed down from the first Apostles was the common source for Paul and the Gospel reports; we can simply say that such characteristic sayings of Jesus could be preserved and noted down independently from several quarters. In Wendt's judgment the passage 1 Thess. iv. 15, where Paul speaks 'by the word of the Lord,' also contains a reference to the historical teaching of Jesus. Wendt maintains that in Paul's assertion that those who have fallen asleep will not remain behind at the coming of the Lord, the Apostle gives an outward representation of the fact that death in this

[1] See also *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 518.

world will not by any means be prejudicial to their gain of heavenly salvation. This same thought, he further maintains, is expressed in the saying of Jesus testified to by all the chief Gospel sources, that he who seeks to save his life shall lose it, and he who loses it shall save it (Mark viii. 25; Log. § 17 b; Matt. x. 39; Luke xvii. 33; John xii. 25); bodily death must be judged by the disciples of Jesus, not as an actual loss of life, but rather as a means to gain the true and healthful life.

The parallel which Wendt thus draws between this passage in the Gospels and 1 Thess. iv. 15, will certainly not commend itself to everyone, and it will be noticed that Wendt himself adds that he does not actually mean that Paul had in mind that precise saying of Jesus, but rather that he gave expression to the conception of Jesus which was the basis of the saying, to which Jesus had Himself given expression in a very different form (comp. John xi. 25 etc.): the introductory formula, *τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου*, appears to Wendt to agree best with this conception.[1]

The one other quotation of a saying of Jesus in the New Testament outside the Gospels which Wendt discusses is Acts xx. 35. If we assume that the address of Paul at Miletus belongs to the so-called 'we' source of the Acts, which the author has employed in the second portion of his work, and that this same source again rests upon eye and ear testimony, then we shall decide that that saying of Jesus has been indirectly handed down to us by Paul; and no doubt the Apostle himself received it from a good source. But even if one does not acknowledge that the address at Miletus has been handed down to us in an authentic form, yet, adds Wendt, one has no ground for doubting the genuineness of the tradition of the saying of Jesus, which agrees admirably with the point of view attributed to Him elsewhere (*e.g.* Mark x. 42 ff.).

Wendt concludes his Appendix with some important remarks upon the traditionary sayings of Jesus outside the

[1] For the connection between St. Paul's conception of the Kingdom of Heaven and the conception in our Gospels, cf. Wendt's *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 326, and see below, chap. v. pp. 310 ff.

New Testament. Of these he says that he can make but little use. He admits the possibility that in the oral tradition of the post-Apostolic age many genuine sayings of Jesus not contained in our Gospel may have been retained for a long period, but we cannot in his opinion derive any favourable conclusions from this possibility with regard to the sayings handed down to us as genuine words of Jesus. Partly these sayings—*e.g.* those which are derived from the Gospel according to the Hebrews—are of such apocryphal origin and of such strange import that they are at once convicted of spuriousness; partly they only recommend themselves to us as authentic because they contain reminiscences of the words of Jesus derived from the Gospels; partly again they have been handed down to us quite unconnected with any context, so that we cannot recognise their original meaning, and on this account we cannot judge of their value.

Amongst these last we may class, in Wendt's opinion, the best and most widely attested of these sayings: *γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι*. The conjecture that this saying belonged to a connection of thought like that preserved in Luke xvi. 1–12, and that thus it may be explained to mean that a man ought to consider his earthly goods as a means towards winning the goods of the kingdom of God—that he ought to give up the one to receive in exchange the other—is one, he admits, of very great interest, but not of sufficient certainty to allow us to regard and employ the saying in question as a contribution towards fixing more accurately our knowledge of the historical teaching of Jesus.[1]

These strictures of Wendt with regard to the alleged traditional sayings of Jesus will be read with interest by those who have studied Dr. Resch's learned discussion of these sayings under the title 'Agrapha,' a work which forms the fifth volume of Gebhardt and Harnack's 'Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.'

The importance of the contribution thus made by Dr. Resch to our knowledge of the sources and relative value of these

[1] Comp. also the strictures of Nösgen upon this traditional saying, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 19, 1891.

sayings has been described at length by Dr. Sanday, in his recent articles in the 'Expositor,'[1] and attention has also been drawn to it by Dr. Salmon in the last edition of his 'Introduction.'[2] Quite apart from its bearing upon Paul's knowledge of the traditional sayings of our Lord, Resch's researches have acquired an additional value for English students in connection with Professor Marshall's interesting articles on 'The Aramaic Gospel': 'We both believe,' writes Professor Marshall, 'in a primitive Semitic document, written by the Apostle Matthew, that this document was used by the three Synoptists, and that its contents can now be recovered only by internal criticism; but Dr. Resch maintains that this primitive Gospel was written in Hebrew, not Aramaic.'[3] But confining ourselves of necessity to that part of Dr. Resch's treatise which is concerned with the Pauline Epistles, it is important to notice that, in a note on page 93 of the 'Agrapha,' Resch finds fault with 'the historical school' of critics, because, moving in a wrong track, they have regarded the four great Pauline Epistles as the oldest primary Christian source, and have not rather interpreted the relationship between the two combined writings, between, *i.e.*, the canonical doctrinal writings and the synoptical Gospels, by means of the common pre-canonical source, *i.e.* the original document (the *Urschrift*) of Christianity. This *Urschrift* Resch considers to have been the *Logia* of the Apostle Matthew, originally written in Hebrew, and to sayings contained in this document, or in different versions of it, he finds as many as thirty-eight parallels or allusions in the Pauline Epistles alone ('Agrapha,' special index, pp. x, xi, and pp. 102–129, 298–300).

Most critics will probably agree with Dr. Sanday that this list stands in need of revision. In Germany, Paul Ewald has criticised it severely. Certainly Ewald's determination not to accept a synoptical tradition apart from a Johannine would naturally disincline him to accept Resch's assertion that there are no Johannine *agrapha*,[4] but, quite apart from this, some

[1] *Expositor*, 4th series, Feb.–May, 1891.
[2] P. 184; comp. also Nösgen, *ubi supra*. [3] *Expositor*, May 1891, p. 375.
[4] Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 25. Comp. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 160.

of his strictures upon Resch's extensive list demand very careful attention.

Ewald's object is to show that there was no *fixed* tradition, *oral* or *written*, of the words of Jesus; in proof of this he points to the phenomena presented by the Apostolic discourses and writings; they very rarely contain any express appeal to the words of Jesus, or any verbal quotation of a 'Logion' of Jesus, often as we might have expected it, and often as our eyes wander involuntarily from the words of these discourses and writings to corresponding words of Jesus in the reports of the Evangelists. It must not be inferred from this that Ewald depreciates Paul's acquaintance with the thoughts and views of Jesus, and indeed with the very words of the Lord; his point is that if there had been *a fixed canon* of the words of Jesus, either oral or written, actual quotations from it would be found in greater numbers, and of pre-eminent importance in their contents.[1] In his own judgment the number of the quotations, their contexts, and especially the mode of their employment, are all opposed to the supposition of any such canon. And it is here that Ewald comes to close quarters with Dr. Resch. With regard, first of all, to the number of quotations, he points out that Resch adduces more than twenty passages from the Pauline Epistles alone which contain more or less distinct formulæ of quotation, and, in addition to these, other passages from the rest of the New Testament writings. But if, adds Ewald, one looks into the matter only a little more attentively, nearly all these formulæ of quotation resolve themselves into nothing.[2]

Ewald takes first of all those instances adduced by Resch which point directly to the authority of a written word, as, *e.g.*, 1 Cor. ii. 9, 'but as it is written' (ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται); 1 Cor. ix. 10, 'for our sakes it was written' (δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη); 1 Tim. v. 8, 'for the Scripture saith' (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή); James iv. 5, 'the Scripture saith' (ἡ γραφὴ λέγει), &c. Even if there prevails 'for the most part the most profound obscurity' as to the origin of the sayings referred to in these

[1] Ewald, *ubi supra*, p. 148 note, 143, and comp. 75.
[2] Ewald, *ubi supra*, p. 143.

passages, yet Ewald maintains that there is no ground for the supposition that the Scripture alluded to is a written report of the life and teaching of Jesus composed in the earliest days of the Church, since it is diametrically opposed to the primitive Christian conception of the 'Scripture' as 'the written word' *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. If that primitive Gospel which Resch assumes was once granted, it would be easier, in Ewald's judgment, to believe that its author had by mistake referred some of its sayings to the Old Testament Scripture, than that he would have thus placed that primitive Gospel on a level with the Old Testament, and even embraced the two in a unity: a formula of quotation of such a kind Ewald confidently regards as proving less than nothing. Incidentally he draws attention to the fact that the supposed or actual quotations, just as those of the sub-canonical time, appear for the most part, not as words of the Lord, but as words of Scripture, as Resch himself describes them in the 'Agrapha.'[1]

Amongst other formulæ upon which Resch relies Ewald dismisses Rom. ii. 16, 'according to my gospel' (*κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου*); whether we think, with some of the Fathers, of the Gospel of Luke, or, with Resch, of the fundamental source of Matthew, the one is as impossible as the other. In the same manner he deals with the formulæ used in the Pastoral Epistles and the Apocalypse: 'faithful is the word,' *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* (1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8), or 'these words are faithful and true' (*οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί εἰσιν*) (Apoc. xxi. 5). Ewald cannot believe that any impartial reader will here undoubtedly receive the impression of a quotation from a written source (as Resch maintains will be the case, 'Agrapha,' p. 262), still less of a quotation of a Logion of Jesus. For such a result Ewald thinks that we might rather refer here to the introductory formula specially peculiar to the Romans and 1 Cor., 'do ye not know?' (*οὐκ οἴδατε;* 1 Cor. vi. 3: *ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε;* 1 Cor. vi. 2: *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε;* Rom. vi. 3; 'Agrapha,' p. 312 & 153). But not only does uncertainty prevail in each of these cases also, but

[1] Ewald, *ubi supra*, p. 143.

there is no question of an actual appeal to a canon of the Lord's words. It is only, in Ewald's view, the mark of an entirely arbitrary exegesis to employ as Resch does in favour of his hypothesis such expressions as those which occur in Col. iii. 18, 'as it is fit in the Lord' (*ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ*), or in 2 Thess. iii. 12, 'we command and exhort in the Lord' (*παραγγέλλομεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ἐν κυρίῳ κ.τ.λ.*), or probably also such a passage as 1 Cor. xiv. 37.

As a result Ewald maintains that of the quotations which may in some degree be regarded as certain Resch has not proved a greater number than was already recognised before he wrote.[1] These quotations he reckons as six: (1) 1 Cor. vii 10 f., 'But unto the married I give charge, *yea* not I, but the Lord, "That the wife depart not from her husband" (*τοῖς δὲ γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω, οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος, γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι κ.τ.λ.*). (2) 1 Cor. ix. 14: 'Even so did the Lord ordain that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel' (*οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν*). (3) 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff.: 'For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you' (*ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*). (4) 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.: 'For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive that are left . . . shall in no wise precede,' &c. (*τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι . . . οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν κ.τ.λ.*). (5) Acts xx. 35: 'And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"' (*μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· Μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν*). (6) Acts xi. 16: 'And I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptised with water; but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost' (*ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς ἔλεγεν. Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ βαπτισθήσεσθε ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*).

This number furnishes a full authoritative testimony, in Ewald's opinion, against the idea of a fixed doctrinal authority, either oral or written, which is said to consist of

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 144.

the words of the Lord, even if the supporter of a complete primitive Gospel (*Urevangelium*) was to add 2 Peter i. 17 ff.: there are more frequent appeals, Ewald asserts, not only to the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, but also to apocryphal books, and even to secular authors, to proverbs and such like, than to words of Jesus. He also reminds us that even the limited list of quotations which he has given might be further diminished if in accordance with the opinion of many interpreters we refer the first, third, and especially the fourth passage out of the six to special revelations, and if we lay stress upon the fact that the sixth passage in the above form is not found in the Gospels at all, but in the Acts (i. 5). Ewald, however, is prepared to admit all six as quotations, but what, he asks, are they amongst so many appeals to the Old Testament, &c.?[1] When he passes to the consideration of the contexts of the six passages Ewald is equally at a loss for any proof of a *fixed* tradition.

The last two passages, 5 and 6, are simply reminiscences of particular sayings of Jesus, which could not be wanting whether the tradition was fixed or not, and they are in themselves of no interest for the theory which Ewald is discussing. In the former passage, viz. 5, one involuntarily recalls, he thinks, the well-known independent apocryphal Logion, *γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι*! and similar words.

The passage marked 3 is certainly, says Ewald, a salient reminiscence, which one might look for within a limited circle of tradition, but it is, he thinks, equally possible that it was handed down independently—*i.e.* without being joined with any homogeneous tradition—on account of the unique character of the event of which it treats.

The passages marked 1 and 4 he describes as *specialia*, which accordingly cannot be regarded as if they formed integral portions of a fundamental doctrinal document.

There is indeed only one passage, viz. 2, which Ewald considers to harmonise fully with the idea of derivation from any such document, yet without in the least requiring such a supposition; and he bids us see in conclusion from this

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 145.

review of the six passages that he had not expressed himself too boldly in saying that there are few traces of what might be expected on the theory of the existence of a fixed tradition.[1]

When he compares these same six quotations with the Synoptical tradition, to the foundation of which they are said fundamentally to belong, he points out that not one of them is in verbal agreement with the sayings contained in the first three Gospels. Even in the passage numbered 3, where an exact agreement might certainly have been expected, if anywhere an endeavour after any kind of final tradition had shown itself, there are striking variations. The same is the case with 1 Cor. vii. 10, where at any rate the first half of verse 11 is very independently expressed ; and with 1 Cor. ix. 10, where the word of the Lord alluded to is only characterised according to its contexts (Matt. x. 10 ; Luke x. 7). Two indeed of the six passages in question have no Synoptical parallels, viz. Acts xx. 35, and 1 Thess. iv. 15 ; for in these cases one cannot do more than establish a harmony with expressions in the Synoptists.

Ewald sees nothing which militates against his position in such passages as 1 Cor. xi. 2 ; 2 Thess. ii. 15, iii. 6 ; where mention is made of a tradition or traditions (*παράδοσις, παραδόσεις*) which Paul has communicated to his readers (compare also 2 Pet. ii. 21) ; or again in Rom. xvi. 25, where 'the preaching of Jesus Christ' (*κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) is mentioned by the side of the gospel of Paul, or again in 1 Tim. vi. 3, where 'sound words, *even* the words of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*ὑγιαίνοντες λόγοι οἱ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) are plainly emphasised ; or, finally, in 1 Cor. vii. 25, where a distinction is expressly drawn between that with regard to which Paul had a command of the Lord (*ἐπιταγή*) and that with regard to which no such command was at his disposal.[2]

In discussing these passages Ewald observes that so far as the *παραδόσεις* are concerned there is no justification whatever for confining them to any collection of the words of the Lord

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 146. [2] *Ibid.* p. 147.

specially corresponding to the Synoptical type, since the context in these passages appears much rather to refer to what lies beyond the material embodied in the Synoptists. In truth, however, it remains on the whole not only undecided 'whether Paul has received or freely arranged the ordinances thus handed down by tradition,' but it appears tolerably clear, in Ewald's judgment, that the Apostle is not concerned with the further promulgation of what had been already received, but with independent ordinances corresponding as a matter of course with the spirit and will of Jesus: this view Ewald thinks is plainly confirmed by the second passage, in which these *παραδόσεις* can be communicated 'either by word or by our letter' (*εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν*). We must, he adds, put a very forced construction upon 1 Thess. iv. 15 &c. if we wish to create the belief that in that passage Paul had in mind a reported communication of the sayings of Jesus. The same explanation of 2 Peter ii. 21 is, in Ewald's judgment, a very natural one, where we have the expression 'from the holy commandment delivered unto them' (*ἐκ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἁγίας ἐντολῆς*); whilst he thinks that if Rom. xvi. 24 is not altogether put on one side by interpreting with Weiss and others the expression 'the preaching of Jesus Christ' (*κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) as though it contained an objective genitive, yet at the most it affirms that Paul was conscious of the agreement of his gospel with the preaching of salvation proclaimed by Jesus Christ.

There remain the two passages 1 Tim. vi. 3 and 1 Cor. vii. 25. With regard to the first, Ewald considers it correct to hold that this passage presupposes that the words of Christ were accessible not only to Timothy, but to Christians in general, although he cannot suppose that these words were limited to the Synoptical tradition only, or that this passage presupposes a canon of the Lord's words as Paul's authority; it is even doubtful, he adds, if the verse in question does refer to actual sayings of Jesus, and not rather to thoughts in harmony with His mind.

With regard to the second, Ewald considers it correct to say that the Apostle draws a distinction between that for

which he can make good a command of the Lord, and that for which he is referred to his own judgment; but here again he cannot accept the view that Paul employs those words of the Lord according to any fixed traditional form, and he is of opinion that the purely subjective expression '*I have no commandment of the Lord*' (οὐκ ἔχω) rather suggests the opposite.[1]

But we should entirely mistake Ewald's meaning if from the above conditions we concluded him to be of opinion that Paul was not well acquainted with the words and thoughts of Jesus. In the important note to which reference has been already made,[2] he remarks that it will no doubt be maintained that 1 Cor. vii. 25 makes it at any rate clear, that Paul regarded the words of the Lord as a high authority. But this, adds Ewald, we also in no way deny; only we cannot, in his judgment, conclude that the Apostle regularly availed himself of these words, or that they lay before him in any fixed traditional form, as is supposed to have been the case. There are exceptional cases, as Ewald terms them, in which the Apostle has recourse to these words—it may be because his own experience and Apostolic consciousness were not in question, as in 1 Thess. iv. 15 &c. and 1 Cor. xi. 23 &c., or because they were insufficient, as in the question of the married life, 1 Cor. vii. 1 &c., or because he would avoid even the appearance of giving mere subjective decisions, as in 1 Cor. ix. 14 (comp. also Acts xx. 35). In general the Apostle is conscious that he is in constant *agreement* with the thoughts and views of Jesus, whilst he gives utterance to his Apostolic opinion as such.

But Ewald also argues for Paul's acquaintance with a rich tradition which extended beyond the material contained either in the first three Gospels, or in the fourth.[3] In support of this he not only allows such passages as Acts xx. 35 and 1 Thess. iv. 15, which are without parallels in our Gospels, but the very important enumeration, in view of the event

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 148. [2] *Ibid.* p. 148, note.

[3] For Ewald's enumeration of the points of contact between St. John's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, see below, chap. v. pp. 329 ff.

with which it is connected, of the appearances of the risen Christ in 1 Cor. xv. 5. This enumeration Ewald describes as a *crux* to the harmonists (since it is only partly in agreement with our Gospels), but as a striking argument for his own theory that there was no *fixed* oral or written tradition, because facts of such exceeding interest as those narrated in 1 Cor. xv. could not have been passed over in such a tradition if it had existed. But if, we may remark in passing, Paul was thus, according to Ewald, in possession of this most important testimony to the cardinal facts of the resurrection of Jesus, which he could confidently place by the side of the traditional material already known to him ; if he was able in exceptional cases to refer to the words of Jesus ; if he could draw a distinction between his own opinion and a command of the Lord ; if he could guard himself against a subjective decision by quoting from a discourse of Jesus, and if his letters are full of instances of the employment of Johannine phraseology and Johannine figures of speech, we are justified in inferring (1) that the Apostle must have felt very sure of his ground ; (2) that the knowledge which he could bring to bear in exceptional cases could have been extended to other cases had occasion required ; (3) that the Jesus of the Pauline Epistles is in word and deed no other than the Jesus of the four Evangelists.

But it is of interest and importance to consider, however imperfectly, the particular Logia which Resch so closely associates with the Pauline Epistles. Other Logia to which he finds allusions in James, 1 Peter, and the Apocalypse, are enumerated by him in later pages of his book ('Agrapha,' pp. 244-293 ; 301-310).

The first Logion (13) to which Resch would trace a reference in St. Paul need not detain us long. The words which Resch quotes from the 'Clem. Hom.' xii. 29, as spoken by 'the prophet of the truth'—an expression which we may readily allow refers to Jesus (comp. Logion 11)—are also familiar to English readers in Bishop Westcott's list of the Apocryphal traditions of the Lord's words—'good must needs come (*τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ*), but blessed is he through whom it comes' ; but a response

to this saying of Jesus in Rom. iii. 8 is certainly not very obvious, especially when Resch would have us believe that the Apostle's opponents combined it with another saying of Jesus, 'it must needs be that offences come' (Matt. xviii. 7 and Luke xvii. 1), with which we find it associated in the 'Clementine Homilies,' and then perverted the two sayings into an attack upon the morality of Paul's teaching.[1]

As Logion 14, Resch quotes three passages from the 'Apostolic Constitutions' to support his view that Jesus connected with the baptismal formula the command *to baptise into His death*, and to this latter command he believes that reference is made by Paul in Rom. vi. 3. Paul may himself have received such a command from oral tradition and from the teaching of the primitive Apostles, and to this it is quite possible, as Paret points out,[2] and as P. Ewald also considers possible,[3] that reference may be made in the formula in Rom. vi. 3, *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε*. That the passages in the 'Apostolic Constitutions' may easily have been derived from Paul's teaching is seen by the way in which one of them (vii. 43) expressly speaks of Christ's death on the cross as that *οὗ τύπον ἔδωκε τὸ βάπτισμα*, which reminds us of Paul's words in Rom. vi. 5 (comp. also Rom. v. 14, for the Apostle's employment of the same word *τύπος*). When we remember the free manner in which the words of the Lord were combined by early Christian writers, and how even on occasion the authority of the Apostles was put on a par with them,[4] it is not difficult to understand that Paul's words would be regarded as referring to a command of Christ Himself. Is it not possible that the expression used by Paul may be referred to our Lord's own words with reference to His own baptism of suffering and death, in St. Mark x. 39; Luke xii. 50?

Logion 15 is formed by the words 'the weak shall be saved by the strong' *τὸ ἀσθενὲς διὰ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ σωθήσεται*, which Resch quotes from the 'Duæ Viæ, vel Judicium Petri'

[1] Nicholson, in his *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 152, places it amongst the possible quotations from that lost Gospel.

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 16. [3] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 144.

[4] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* 2. Aufl. pp. 26, 27, 34, 1889.

[= Κανόνες ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων], cap. 26, and to which he believes that Paul refers in 1 Cor. i. 25. But in the first place, it would seem more probable from the preceding verses that Paul had in mind passages of the Old Testament like Isaiah xxix. 14; and it is to be remembered that when Resch adduces another Logion, which he admits is a parallel in meaning to the one under discussion, 'For those that are sick I was sick, and for those that hunger I suffered hunger, and for those that thirst I suffered thirst' (Διὰ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἠσθένουν κ.τ.λ., Logion 47), it is quite probable that both Logia were only adaptations of the same passage in St. Matthew xxv. 35, 36.[1] There is nothing strange in finding the words of the Lord transmitted thus freely and orally, but still transmitted in their essence.[2]

Logion 16 might be fairly described as one of those instances to which Ewald's criticism is applicable with respect to the use of the formula 'as it is written,' or 'as saith the Scripture.' And in this criticism Ewald is supported by the recent remarks of Schmiedel.[3] In Schmiedel's view it is very improbable that in this Logion 1 Cor. ii. 9 Paul is quoting, as Resch maintains, from a Hebrew *Urevangelium*, and

[1] See the remarks of Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 27, 32. These references are of interest because they give us Keim's opinion as to the alleged sayings of Jesus outside the Gospels. He is not inclined to value them very highly, and many of them he regards as distinguished by no strongly marked peculiarity from those we already possess; they may have been actually uttered by Jesus, or afterwards elaborated in the Church out of older material. Thus the Logion mentioned above (15) recalls, in Keim's judgment, Matt. xxv. 35; comp. Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 460, for the same parallel.

[2] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 27.

[3] *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. p. 79, erste Abtheilung, 1. Hälfte, 1890.

The introduction of the passage in 1 Cor. ii. 9, by Clement of Rome in his 1 Cor. 34, one of the passages cited by Resch, *may* be added to the other and undoubted proofs that he was acquainted with Paul's Epistle, although he is closer to the LXX of Isaiah lxiv. 4, in the words τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν. The fact that he introduces this passage with his usual formula of Scripture quotation, λέγει γὰρ, shows that he regarded it as canonical. Meyer, *in loco*, p. 63.

See *Expositor* for June 1891, where (pp. 408, 409) the passage in question is referred to the Old Testament, and evidence is given in support of the view that in the Greek Liturgy of St. James the words of 1 Cor. ii. 9 are quoted from St. Paul, as against Dr. Littledale's view that the Apostle was quoting from the Liturgy (see *Translation of the Primitive Liturgies*, p. 51, note).

improbable that the author of the 'Apocalypse of Elijah,' as Resch also supposes, is quoting from a similar work.

Schmiedel holds that Paul is himself quoting from the lost apocryphal 'Apocalypse of Elijah,' since Apocalyptic works, without belonging to the Old Testament, were frequently reckoned as inspired, and so classed as 'Scripture' (γραφή). He bases this view of the quotation in 1 Cor. ii. 9 (καθὼς γέγραπται) upon the authority of Origen. Or Paul himself, he thinks, may have believed that he was quoting an Old Testament passage. There are three passages in Isaiah the words of which may have been in the Apostle's mind, lxiv. 4, lxv. 16, and lii. 15, and it is quite possible that he combined and freely adapted these passages in their bearing upon his purpose. It seems somewhat fanciful on the part of Dr. Resch to argue that 1 Cor. ii. 9 was derived from what he considers to have been the original conclusion of the parable in Matt. xxv. 34–46, a conclusion which he believes is retained for us in its completeness in the passage which he quotes (p. 164) from the 'Apost. Const.' vii. 32. He thinks that the view which he here advocates is rendered more probable from the fact that Paul so often refers to this parable in Matt. xxv., and he gives several instances in proof of this (pp. 164, 165): *e.g.* Rom. ix. 22, 23, and Matt. xxv. 34; 2 Cor. v. 10, and Matt. xxv. 31–33. But all that the passage in the 'Apost. Const.' shows is that we have in it another instance of that same frequent combination and intermingling of the words of the Lord with Old Testament writings which so often meets us in the literature of the early Church,[1] and the phraseology adopted by Paul, whilst it may point to the fact that he was acquainted with the parable in Matt. xxv., cannot be said to justify Resch's inference ('Agrapha,' p. 165).

Logion 17 is quoted by Bishop Westcott in an interesting note, in which he points out that the saying occurs substantially in the LXX of Isaiah xxiv. 16. (Comp. Resch, 'Agrapha,' p. 165.) Dr. Westcott quotes it in two forms:

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 28; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 458, where he points out that the words quoted in Barn. *Ep.* c. 6, ἴδου ποιήσω τὰ ἔσχατα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα, seem to be a mixture of Ezek. xxxvi. 11, and Matt. xix. 30.

'We remember our Lord and Master, how he said to us, *Keep the mysteries for me and for the sons of my house*' (Τὰ μυστήρια ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου φυλάξατε, 'Clem. Hom.' xix. 20); and 'It was not through unwillingness to impart His blessings that the Lord announced in some Gospel or other, *My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house* (Μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου, Clem. Alex. 'Strom.' v. 10, 64). The words in Isaiah are these:— Τὸ μυστήριόν μου ἐμοί, τὸ μυστήριόν μου ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς. But whilst it will be noted that this saying is only described as found 'in some Gospel or other' (ἔν τινι εὐαγγελίῳ: see Westcott, *ubi supra*), and whilst we must also take into account what Dr. Sanday describes as 'the tendency to give a specifically Christian interpretation to all parts alike of the Old Testament,' yet the Logion finds a striking parallel in Mark iv. 11, and contains the same thought, as Resch points out which Paul expresses in 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2 ('Agrapha,' p. 169).

In Logion 18, if the formula γέγραπται γὰρ forbids us to refer the words κολλᾶσθε τοῖς ἁγίοις ὅτι οἱ κολλώμενοι αὐτοῖς ἁγιασθήσονται (Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 46) to 1 Cor. vii. 14 (comp. vi. 17), it is of interest in passing to note the connection to which Resch refers between Paul's use of the word ἅγιοι and the familiar language of John xvii. 17 ('Agrapha,' p. 170).

Logion 20 requires more attention, because it is closely connected with the passage which is so frequently acknowledged as an allusion by Paul to a saying in our Gospels (1 Cor. ix. 14). Here, in this Logion, 1 Cor. ix. 10, we have a similar expression to some of those already discussed and referred to by P. Ewald—'for our sakes *it was written*' (δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη). Resch, in discussing this passage, refers to Paret's 'Paulus und Jesus,'[1] where it is maintained that in 1 Cor. ix. 10 we have a word of the Lord known to Paul by oral tradition, but which by a slip of memory the Apostle referred to the Old Testament. But Resch believes that if we accept the view that Paul took the words in question out of the written Hebrew *Urevangelium* all

[1] The remarks of Paret (to which Resch refers) will be found in his *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 45.

becomes plain, and he refers to the fact that a definite quotation of the Lord's words is given in 1 Cor. ix. 14, and also that in 1 Tim. v. 18 the quotation is placed on a level as 'the Scripture' (*ἡ γραφή*) with the Old Testament passage Deut. xxv. 4 cited in 1 Cor. ix. 9. But, in the first place, it must be remembered that a very large number of critics accept 1 Cor. ix. 14 as a quotation of the words of Christ who are not prepared to regard 1 Cor. ix. 10 in the same light; and, in the next place, it is very doubtful whether, if we take into account Paul's general usage, the term *ἡ γραφή* in 1 Tim. v. 18 can be referred to both parts of the verse, and not rather to the Old Testament passage only. But Resch does not affirm that Paul introduces the words of Jesus verbally in 1 Cor. ix. 10 or 14, and he is content to point out that as the fundamental thought in verse 10, 'in hope' (*ἐπ' ἐλπίδι*), is not contained in Deut. xxv. 4, the Old Testament passage quoted in verse 9, a new source of quotation is demanded in verse 10. The *δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη* of verse 10 may, however, be amply explained by regarding it as explicative, and not as implying a fresh quotation.[1]

Logion 21, 'For He said, Many shall come in my name, clad without in sheepskins, but within they are ravening wolves; and, *There shall be divisions and heresies*' (*ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις*), is discussed by Dr. Sanday, and he thinks it proved that the saying was current as a saying of Christ, and also that it was referred to by St. Paul in the passage 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19, in which Resch traces an allusion to it. But a very different view is taken by Dr. Weiss:[2] he speaks of the mode of quotation adopted by Justin Martyr, from whom ('Dial. c. Tryph.' c. 35) the Logion in its above form is taken, how he intermixes the words of the Lord with Old Testament citations ('Apol.' i. 48), and how in the midst of a series of the Lord's words a sentence is inserted which can only arise out of a reminiscence of 1 Cor. xi. 18 (*ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἱρέσεις*). But at any rate Resch seems to go too far in fixing the exact position of this Logion in the *Urevangelium* 'Agrapha,' p. 177), and in supposing that in the expression

[1] Meyer, *Korintherbriefe, in loc.*; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 271, note.
[2] *Einleitung in das N. T.* 2. Aufl. pp. 28 and 48, 1889.

'for there *must be* (δεῖ) also heresies among you' (αἱρέσεις: comp. σχίσματα in the previous verse; 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19) the first readers of the Epistle, who already knew of the Logion, would see a direct reference to it. Why should not the alleged Logion, as Dr. Westcott says, 'have been formed from the sense of our Lord's words and the form of 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19'? But when Resch proceeds to maintain that without this Logion the Lord's prophetic words would be incomplete, if He had not foreseen and foretold the divisions and heresies which would come upon His Church ('Agrapha,' p. 175), there are surely many words of Christ which indicate that such results would follow, and Paul, we may readily admit, testifies by his δεῖ how fully he knew the sayings and the mind of Christ.[1]

In Logion 22 Resch maintains that Paul is quoting from the same written source which he so frequently uses; the introductory formula 'for I received from the Lord' (ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου) is to be considered as marking a quotation from this written source, and the special relationship between the Pauline and Lucan accounts of the Lord's Supper depends upon the common use of an identical version—*i.e.* a recension of the original Hebraic source—as distinguished from the version followed by Matthew and Mark. But in addition to these conclusions Resch also believes that 1 Cor. xi. 26 contains, not the words of Paul, but the words of Jesus. In support of this view he quotes among other passages 'Apost. Const.' viii. 12, the Liturgy of St. Mark, and the Latin translation of the Liturgy of St. James, in all of which the words 'until he come' (ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ἔλθῃ, 1 Cor. xi. 26) are changed into the first person, and closely preceded by the expression 'ye proclaim *my* death' (τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμὸν καταγγέλλετε: mortem meam annuntiabitis). But as no evidence has yet been produced to prove that any written Liturgies were in existence in the first century, it is far less

[1] Mr. Nicholson in discussing this Logion points out that the form in which it is found in the *Clem. Hom.* xvi. 21 is quite consistent with the theory that only the *sense* of *various* prophecies of Jesus is being given, although he thinks it probable from the double coincidence of Justin that in some Gospel or other the word 'heresies' was put into the mouth of Jesus.—*Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 156.

difficult to suppose that their compilers, writing at a later date, embodied the words of St. Paul in the form above quoted than to assume that the Apostle's words in 1 Cor. xi. are a quotation from a written *Urevangelium*,[1] the existence of which is purely hypothetical.

In the Logion numbered 24[2] it is not surprising that Resch should have incurred P. Ewald's condemnation, *αἱ γυναῖκες ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν*, as it seems nothing less than arbitrary to find in passages like Col. iii. 18, in the expression *ὡς ἀνῆκεν ἐν κυρίῳ*, and 1 Cor. xiv. 37, references to a written *Urevangelium*. The same may be said of 1 Cor. vii. 10 ('Agrapha,' p. 185), although Resch does not appear altogether to exclude the possibility of oral tradition in his examination of the passages in question ('Agrapha,' p. 186). At the same time these passages afford us another proof of the manner in which Paul's teaching was in perfect harmony with that of Jesus. But the Old Testament would be quite sufficient for the command of both Peter and Paul that the women should be in subjection to their husbands, without referring such a command to a definite saying of Jesus. Resch admits the connection between the command given in Ephes. v. 22, 24; Col. iii. 18; 1 Peter iii. 1, 5, &c. and Gen. iii. 16, and Peter might naturally recall this last passage in speaking of the holy women of the Patriarchal days.

Logion 26, *ἀνὴρ ἀδόκιμος ἀπείραστος* reminds us of James i. 12 as much as, if not more than, of 2 Cor. xiii. 5-7, and if the verse in James is really some saying of our Lord, as there is reason to believe, St. Paul's use of the word *ἀδόκιμος* and the stress he lays upon it may indicate that he, no less than St. James, was acquainted with this saying of Christ.

[1] See *Expositor* for June 1891, 'Is the Apostolic Liturgy quoted by St. Paul?' p. 408. On the introduction of these words of Paul into the *Apost. Const.* as if they were the words of Christ, see Meyer, *Kirchenväter*, i. 320, 321; and on the misunderstanding of the passage by which they found a place in the ancient Liturgies in the same form, see Schmiedel in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. 131, erste Abtheilung, ii. Hälfte. 1891.

Renan's remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 23 ff. are also of interest in connection with the above: see *Les Evangiles*, p. 78, note 1.

[2] *Ubi supra*, p. 144.

Logion 27, which Resch quotes from the narrative of the man working on the Sabbath in Codex D, and which, he argues, formed a part of the oldest Gospel source, could be better supported, as P. Ewald points out (p. 160, *ubi supra*), by referring to the original Judaic-Christian character of the Codex—which would scarcely have been favourable to the introduction of such a saying of Christ as this part of it contains if it had not been genuine—rather than to the verbal coincidences with Paul and James. It certainly does seem rather fanciful when Resch finds an argument in support of his theory in the fact that Paul and James use the expression *παραβάτης νόμου*, which occurs in the narrative in Codex D, or that because Luke (xii. 14) and Paul (Rom. ii. 1) use the same form of address, *ἄνθρωπε—ὦ ἄνθρωπε*, they had recourse to some older Gospel source employed by both of them, containing the narrative in Codex D, in which the same form of expression occurs.[1]

With regard to Logion 28, *ἐδικαιώθη τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ὑμᾶς*, we must remember that Resch himself points out that it is quoted in 'Apost. Const.' ii. 60, in immediate connection with Logion 58. In this latter Logion, *ἐδικαιώθη Σόδομα ἐκ σοῦ*, it seems that we have one of those combinations of parallel passages in the Gospels so frequent in early Church writers (comp. Resch, 'Agrapha,' p. 259), *e.g.* Matt. xi. 20, 24, 19, Luke vii. 35, x. 12, and the former (Logion 28) may merely contain an inference from the latter (Logion 58), or it may be a reminiscence of the thought expressed by Paul in Gal. iii. 8.

In Logia 30–37 Resch finds allusions to one Epistle, viz. the Ephesians, and it must be remembered that in arguing from it to St. Paul's acquaintance with the words and thoughts of Jesus, we are dealing with one of those Epistles which negative critics regard as very doubtful. In this Epistle Resch believes that there are more allusions to the written Hebrew *Urevangelium* than in any other ('Agrapha,' p. 195).

Logion 30 comprises the strange saying, 'When the two

[1] Keim, *ubi supra*, in discussing this extra-canonical saying of Jesus, classes it amongst those which would directly contradict our knowledge of the character of His teaching derived from other sources.

shall be one, and that which is without as that which is within, and the male with the female neither male nor female' (Clem. Rom. 'Ep.' ii. 12), prefaced by the words 'The Lord Himself having been asked by some one when His Kingdom will come, said' (*ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπό τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἓν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ*). Bishop Westcott compares this with Gal. iii. 28[1] (see also Resch, 'Agrapha,' pp. 201, 202), and speaks of it as a mystical saying very different in form from the character of our Lord's words[2] (comp. *ubi supra*, p. 460). Resch takes each of its four parts and examines them at considerable length. With regard to the first part, *ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἓν*, he finds interesting parallels in Ephes. ii. 14–16, 18, but it appears somewhat fanciful to suppose that it must have been before Paul's mind in Gal. iii. 20, or to find any point of connection with the second part *καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω* in 2 Cor. iv. 10. At the same time, when we consider the mystical and fanciful manner of treating the Lord's words, it does not seem altogether improbable that we have here a free combination of such passages in the Gospels as John x. 12–16; Matt. xxiii. 26; Mark vii. 18; Luke xvii. 20; and possibly Matt. xxvii. 30; Mark xii. 25; Luke xx. 35 (comp. 'Agrapha,' p. 202).

In Logion 31, alluded to in Ephes. ii. 17, *ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς*, it is difficult to suppose that anything more than an Old Testament parallel, Isaiah lvii. 19, is in the writer's mind, and in 'Apost. Const.' ii. 54 ('Agrapha,' p. 109), the phrase *καθὼς γέγραπται* which introduces this Logion does not demand anything more; the same remark may apply to the words associated with the Logion under

[1] The good instance of the mixture of a mystic explanation with a simple text from the *Πίστις Σοφία* to which Westcott refers in this connection, as quoted by Tischendorf on Matt. xxiv. 22, is as follows: *ἐκολόβωσα τοὺς καιροὺς διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς μου· εἰ μή, οὐκ ἂν πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐσώθη. ἐκολόβωσα δὲ τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς χρόνους διὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν τέλειον τῶν ψυχῶν αἳ λήψονται τὸ μυστήριον· αὗταί εἰσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοί· καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσα τοὺς χρόνους, οὐκ ἂν πᾶσα ψυχὴ ὑλικὴ ἐσώθη.* Tischendorf, *N. T. Græce*, edit. 7, 1859.

[2] Comp. also the strictures of Keim, *ubi supra*, p. 32.

the same formula *καθὼς γέγραπται* in 'Apost. Const.' ii. 54, *οὓς ἔγνω κύριος ὄντας αὐτοῦ*, and also to 2 Tim. ii. 19 (comp. Num. xvi. 5), although it is quite possible that Paul had in mind the manner in which the Lord Jesus uses the word *ἔγνω*, Matt. vii. 23; Luke xiii. 27; and the way in which He speaks in these passages certainly contains an interesting parallel with Paul's words in 2 Tim. ii. 19 ('Agrapha,' p. 207).

Logion 32 may present a parallel with Matt. xxiii. 9, but because in Ephes. iii. 15 Paul uses the verb *ὀνομάζεται*, which is not found in the passages quoted by Resch from extra-canonical writings, we cannot argue that the verb in question is an addition made by Paul to the original Logion to show that he was making a quotation, and that it was afterwards omitted by later writers ('Agrapha,' p. 207). There is no proof that the words are not, in each of the extra-canonical passages, a reminiscence of the words of Paul in Ephes. iii. 15.

The familiar words in Logion 33, 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath,' need not contain a saying of Christ. The words in all probability are a reminiscence of Deut. xxiv. 15, just as the first part of the verse may be referred to Psalm iv. 5. In Polycarp 'Ad Phil.' xii. 1, it is noteworthy that we have the two passages of the Old Testament similarly combined, and it is difficult to believe that we have not in this case a reminiscence of Ephes. iv. 26 (comp. Salmon 'Introduction to the N. T.' p. 389, and Holtzmann 'Einleitung in das N. T.' p. 290). On the other hand, Weiss, who admits the reference to the Old Testament, cannot believe that Polycarp quotes directly from the Ephesians ('Einleitung in das N. T.' p. 33), whilst Meyer apparently favours the view that in the expression *καθὼς ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἴρηται* with which the passage is introduced, Polycarp refers to the Old Testament, although he admits a possible reference to Ephesians (*Der Brief an die Epheser*, 'Einleitung,' p. 28). In the 'Vita S. Syncleticæ,' from which Resch also quotes, we seem to have another of those combinations to which Weiss refers, and which might easily arise in a quotation from memory. The other passages quoted by Resch may probably be explained by referring them to the

Old Testament, or, at all events, to the preaching of the Apostles, and none of them can be said to afford a proof that the Logion in question was an actual utterance of Christ, or that it must be referred to a written Gospel source.

The command, *μὴ δότε πρόφασιν τῷ πονηρῷ*, which Resch regards as a Logion (34), cannot be said to be supported by any strong patristic testimony. The only passage to which Resch refers is one in the 'Clem. Hom.' xix. 2, and here the words *may* be a reminiscence of Ephes. iv. 27, or they *may* be one of the traditionary sayings of Christ (comp., however, Meyer *in loco*, and Westcott, p. 460, *ubi supra*).

Logion 56, which Resch regards as closely akin to the one in question, *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ*, does not require us to believe that it found a place in an original Hebrew document from which James, Peter, and Paul all derived it ('Agrapha,' p. 258). There is good reason to believe that the Epistle of James was used by Peter in his first Epistle, and possibly the Ephesians also, and the quotation in Hermas ('Mand.' xii. 2, 4), *ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν*, is evidently a quotation from James iv. 7, an Epistle upon which the writer frequently depends (Weiss, 'Einleitung in das N. T.' p. 37).

In Logion 35 it is probable that we have one of the *ἄγραφα δόγματα* or unrecorded sayings of Christ, but it can hardly be said that its connection with Ephes. iv. 28 is very obvious. But if the 'Didaché' (i. 6), in which this Logion occurs, 'Let thine alms sweat into thy hands, so long as thou knowest to whom thou givest' (*ἱδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, μέχρις ἂν γνῷς τίνι δῷς*) was 'an intensely Jewish document,' the words may have been taken from some Jewish manual reckoned as a sacred authority, as the command is prefaced by the formula *εἴρηται*.

Logion 36 *a* is said to be quoted in a work to which Resch in this connection attaches much importance, the 'De Aleatoribus' of the Pseudo-Cyprian, which may be, in Harnack's judgment, the oldest Latin Christian writing. Harnack himself ascribes it to Victor of Rome, and places it at the close of the second century—an early date which Dr. Salmon, with other critics, is altogether unable to accept.

The Logion, according to Harnack, runs as follows: 'Monet Dominus et dicit: *nolite contristare Spiritum Sanctum, qui in vobis est, et nolite exstinguere lumen, quod in vobis effulsit*; and he believes that we have here two separate quotations. Resch argues that the whole passage forms only one Logion, and that the two parts afford an instance of Hebrew parallelism, and therefore a proof of its original Hebrew form. In Greek he points out that the Logion would run thus: *παρακαλῶν φησὶν ὁ κύριος· Μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν κατοικοῦν, καὶ μὴ σβέννυτε τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐπιπεφαγκός.* And to this Logion he finds a reference not only in Ephes. iv. 30, but also in 1 Thess. v. 19, for when Paul says '*Quench* not the Spirit,' *τὸ πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε*, he presupposes that the Spirit is a light.

But we have what certainly may be a much earlier reference to the first part of this Logion in Hermas, 'Mand.' x. 2, 5, where words are used which seem to be a reminiscence of Ephes. iv. 30 combined with James iv. 5, two Epistles with both of which there is reason to believe that Hermas was familiar.[1] Resch himself admits that there is an evident relationship between various passages in Hermas' 'Mand.' and Ephes. iv. 25, 29, 31 ('Agrapha,' p. 218, 219). But he thinks it possible that as words of the Lord are contained in Ephes. iv. 26, 27, 28, 30, 32 (see p. 219 and Logia 33–36*a*), so also verses 25, 29, 31, in the same chapter, may be referred to words of the Lord, which Hermas derived from a pre-canonical Gospel source. He therefore argues for the possibility that the whole section Ephes. iv. 25–v. 1, carries us back to words of the Lord derived from this same source. But it is plain that such a line of argument must be very conjectural. We may notice in passing that Dr. Resch, in support of his position that Logion 36 *a* is derived from this pre-canonical Gospel source, points to the striking relationship between the words of the Logion and passages in our canonical Gospels, *e.g.* Matt. vi. 33, Luke xi. 35. But as 1 Thess. v. 19 and Ephes. iv. 30 are also closely connected by Resch with this Logion,

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 37; Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 290; Salmon, *Introduction*, p. 389.

a further relationship is thus established between these passages in the Epistles, and the language of the Gospels (comp. also Ephes. v. 8, and Luke xvi. 8, 'Agrapha,' p. 217).

Logion 36 *b* is of interest because whilst Resch does not give any definite Pauline parallel to it ('Agrapha,' p. xi) he finds a connection between the first part of the Logion and the phraseology, not only of Paul, but of John. Thus the expression 'ita me in vobis videte' finds a parallel in John xiv. 20, 'You in me, and I in you' (*ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν*), John xiv. 20, and Gal. ii. 20, 'But Christ liveth in me' (*ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός*), ('Agrapha,' p. 222).

Logion 37 gives us one of those New Testament passages (Ephes. v. 14) which have sometimes been referred to some well-known Christian hymn, sometimes to various passages of the Old Testament, sometimes to an unknown apocryphal writing ('Agrapha,' p. 226; Meyer, *in loco*).

By Epiphanius it is distinctly ascribed to the apocryphal 'Apocalypse of Elijah,' and Resch thinks that possibly both Origen and Hippolytus refer it to the same writing (pp. 223, 224). But Resch seems undecided for his own part as to whether it can be referred to a word of the Lord. The parallels which he quotes show that the saying may be easily connected with sayings of Christ in the Gospels employed both in a literal and in a metaphorical sense; comp. *e.g.* Matt. ix. 5, Luke v. 24, Matt. ix. 5, Luke vii. 14, Mark v. 39, Mark v. 41, Luke viii. 52, Matt. ix. 24; comp. also Luke ix. 60, xv. 24, 32 &c. ('Agrapha, p. 225).

Logion 39 contains one of those sayings to which Resch allows that parallels may be found in the Old Testament, and he quotes two from Ezekiel (LXX) xviii. 30, xxxiii. 30,[1] (p. 227), in which the word *κρινῶ* is emphasised just as

[1] Westcott also parallels the saying with Ezek. xxxiii. 20, xxiv. 14. Keim compares it with Matt. xxiv. 40, xxv. 1 (see *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 29). Dr. Sanday thinks that the authorship of Ezekiel, to whom this saying is referred in the *Vita S. Antonii* (at the end of the fourth century), probably applies to some apocryphal work bearing the prophet's name, and that Justin refers it to Christ by a slip of memory, aided by the tendency already in force to give a specifically Christian interpretation to all parts alike of the Old Testament (*Expositor*, June 1891, p. 419). But Resch also admits the existence of this apocryphal book, and that it was known to Josephus (*Agrapha*, p. 290).

in the Logion. The words of the latter are these, as they are found in Justin Martyr ('Dial. c. Tryph.' 47): *In whatsoever I may find you, in this will I also judge you* ('Εν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ), and the words are introduced by Justin thus: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ said' (ὁ ἡμέτερος Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν). But Resch maintains that both Justin and Paul had the original Logion before them, and that they adopted the same rendering of the Hebrew verb which admits of the three variations all found in the different versions of the Logion quoted by Resch, καταλαμβάνειν—εὑρίσκειν—αἱρέειν (pp. 227–229). But it is certainly somewhat fanciful to find a reference to the Logion in 1 Thess. v. 4, and still more fanciful to find another in Phil. iii. 12, to account for such allusions by referring them to the Apostolic way of playing upon the words of Christ, and to see in these Pauline allusions, which only consist in the employment of the same verb καταλαμβάνειν, a guarantee of the Christian origin of the Logion.

With regard to Logion 43, in the discussion of which Resch, as Dr. Sanday says, 'surpasses himself' in the numbers of allusions which he finds, is the connection between it and 1 Thess. v. 21 so certain as it is generally assumed to be? The most recent German criticism seems to doubt it. Resch refers to the use by Hesychius of the words εἶδος νομίσματος to prove that εἶδος, the word used by Paul in 1 Thess. v. 21, meant 'a kind of coin,' and that therefore this verse may be fitly connected with the Logion 'Show yourselves approved *money-changers*' (γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι), in which the idea is not that of banking, but of *money-changing*, 'the taking of coin as bad or good.' But εἶδος νομίσματος, as Schmiedel points out,[1] is one thing, εἶδος by itself may be quite another; and he remarks that it is unnecessary to interpret the word in 1 Thess. v. 21, of the changing of coin because the Church Fathers have connected with this verse the ἄγραφον of Jesus. There seems to be no valid proof that the Logion in question and 1 Thess. v. 21 were originally part of one saying. Weiss sees no difficulty in believing that the saying was probably

[1] *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. 25, erste Abtheilung, i. Hälfte, 1890.

known by oral tradition in spite of the fact that Clement of Alexandria ('Strom.' i. 28) quotes it as γραφή,[1] but a strong case may be made out for its derivation from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.[2]

A final judgment on Resch's laborious work is yet to be passed: but even the criticism which fully appreciates the interest of his remarks admits that there are many difficulties in the way of accepting his conclusions. The German writer Herr Bousset, *e.g.*, whom Dr. Sanday describes as 'an independent follower of Resch,' points out these difficulties very frankly, and allows that there is much to be said for them.[3] Resch's method, Bousset maintains, is too hasty, and his conclusions too bold. His opinion that the *Urevangelium*, which he claims to have discovered, was quoted by Paul as γραφή is entirely rejected. In his attempt to prove that many sayings which appear originally to have belonged to Paul, are quoted in patristic literature as words of the Lord, he has not sufficiently weighed the possibility of a confusion of memory, by which words of the Lord might be ascribed to Paul. The second leading proof which Resch adduces on behalf of his supposed Gospel is in Bousset's judgment no more valid than the former. The manner in which Resch refers each variation in the text to a Hebrew written *Urevangelium* is somewhat injudicious: he has not sufficiently considered the possibility that through oral tradition many textual variations could perpetuate themselves, and that many extra-canonical sayings of the Lord could be handed down by oral tradition, and he has regarded the patristic quotations and the variations in the manuscripts as too literally true. Finally, his supposition that that extra-canonical material, which he has collected so copiously, is to be referred back to a pre-canonical Gospel is nothing but an hypothesis. Even supposing that Resch has right on his side, how is it

[1] *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 52.

[2] Salmon, *Introduction*, p. 162, 5th edit. Nicholson, *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 157. Keim compares the saying to Matt. xxv. 27, or considers that it may be an aftergrowth from it.

[3] *Die Evangeliencitate Justins Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*, pp. 9, 10, 11, 42, 43. 1891.

conceivable, asks Bousset, that such a Gospel as Resch assumes to have existed, which must not only have been a collection of the sayings of the Lord, but a true *Urevangelium*, which Paul quoted as a γραφή, which was used by almost all the New Testament writers, and which most of the older Church Fathers must have known—how is it conceivable that such a document should have vanished without leaving a trace behind? But whilst he grants that there is force in most of these objections, Bousset adds that in face of the numerous materials which Resch has collected, it must be admitted that problems still exist in this field of inquiry. The fact at any rate cannot be denied that even writers of a later period, of the third, fourth, and even fifth century, had before them words of the Lord in a *fixed written form*, some of which are not found in our canonical Gospels at all, and others only in a very different shape. Whether this fact can be explained on the supposition of manuscript variations or entire written Gospels, or whether it points to one or more lost Gospels, remains for the present undecided. At all events, Bousset concludes that the attempt must fail to explain from oral tradition all the materials which Resch has collected, and their wide diffusion. On the same page, however, he admits that oral tradition can be employed as the explanation of a series of such isolated Logia as those collected by Resch, although he thinks it inconceivable that any rich and comprehensive tradition of the Lord's words could have been maintained through a long period by oral tradition alone.

But before we are justified in arguing back from the passages collected with such diligent care by Resch, or from the Pauline Epistles in combination with them, to a written Hebrew *Urevangelium*, the work of the Apostle St. Matthew, usually known as the 'Logia,' we must have more positive grounds for believing that the variations which occur in the passages quoted by Resch, and in their Pauline parallels, are due to different translations of some Hebrew word in the original Hebrew Gospel. Even if Resch's theory was admitted with regard to later quotations, it cannot be proved that in the case of St. Paul the variations may not have been in an *oral*,

and not in a *written*, Hebrew tradition. We must also take care to bear in mind the strictures of Dr. Sanday, (1) that 'the critic must be on the watch for variants which have arisen, not from any fundamental Hebrew, but simply in the course of transmission of the Greek text'; (2) 'the influence which one writer exercised upon another, and the extent to which some particular form of quotation may have been simply passed on from hand to hand.'[1]

These considerations, together with the strictures of Wendt and Bousset, to which may now be added those of Nösgen,[2] must be carefully weighed, and it will be found helpful to consult on the general method of the patristic quotations the sections by Dr. Weiss entitled *The Canon of the Lord's Words* and *The Oldest Traces of the New Testament Epistles* in his 'Introduction to the New Testament.'[3]

But quite apart from these aspects of the question, there is a further value attaching to the 'Agrapha' of Dr. Resch. It may help to some extent to strengthen the view, maintained

[1] In his review of Resch's *Agrapha* in the *Expositor*, June 1891.

[2] Nösgen allows that as the New Testament writings do not claim to give us a complete account of the facts of revelation, so it is possible that our knowledge may be increased by extra-canonical sources, and that many unwritten words of Jesus and His Apostles may have been preserved to us. But he points out that even if we should admit all that Dr. Resch has lately adduced, the New Testament would gain no important enrichment, for we should have only what is already contained in our Gospels in another form, or what is entirely new (see also p. 104, above), *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, pp. 18, 19, 1891.

[3] *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 21–32 ff. 1889, 2. Aufl. See also Dr. Salmon's remarks on patristic quotations in his *Introduction to the N. T.* pp. 52, 62, 96, 97, 5th edit. Reuss (*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* 1887, 6. Aufl. p. 164) also reminds us of the importance of memory and oral tradition in retaining the sayings of Jesus: the form in which many of these sayings appear in the patristic writings may just as well be referred to memory as to written documents unknown to us (comp. also p. 323). In this edition Reuss, whilst admitting that it cannot be precisely determined whether Paul obtained his knowledge of the history of Jesus from written sources or not, thinks that on the whole the probabilities are against it, and that access to any such written sources cannot be proved from 1 Cor. xi. 23, and still less from 1 Cor. xv.

Mr. Nicholson would refer many of the important *Agrapha* enumerated by Resch with more or less probability to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (see his work mentioned above, pp. 148–162). Amongst others we may enumerate: 'Keep the mysteries for Me and for the sons of My house'; 'Good must needs come, but blessed is he through whom it comes'; 'For in such as I find you in such will I also judge you'; 'Show yourselves tried bankers'; &c., &c.

in the following chapters, that St. Paul was closely acquainted with the mind of Jesus, and that although his Epistles afford few verbal parallels with our Gospels, yet they are pervaded by the same spirit, and presuppose the life and teaching of the same Divine Saviour.[1]

We have travelled a long way from the days of Strauss's first 'Leben Jesu.' It is now fifty-three years ago that C. Ullmann so strongly condemned the attempt to write a 'Life of Jesus' without taking into account the Pauline Epistles,[2] with their fatal bearing upon Strauss's statement of the mythical theory; and we have lived to see a writer of a very different school, Theodor Keim, reject with equal scorn the same attempt, and precisely *upon the same grounds*.[3] Keim, it is true, never freed himself from the influence of the mythical theory, but we hope that this chapter has sufficiently shown that both he and many of his fellow-countrymen, representing widely different schools of thought, have recognised in these Pauline Epistles a firm historical basis for the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, even where they have not fully acknowledged the import of His mission, or the truth of His Divine nature.

[1] Resch's *Agrapha* forms, as we have mentioned, vol. v. in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, and although Harnack's own work, to which reference has been made, belongs more especially to Church History, it has many points of contact with the subject of this chapter. Harnack's position, in this relation, sometimes reminds us of that of Weizsäcker, to whom he expresses his warmest thanks in the second edition of his *Dogmengeschichte*. Although Harnack, as might be expected, considers that the death and resurrection of Christ form the central points of Paul's preaching, and although he maintains that it must remain an open question how far the most weighty Christian conceptions were derived from Paul, or were already found in existence by him (*ubi supra*, p. 113, and especially Proleg. to the *Didaché*, p. 64), he admits that the Apostle must have possessed an accurate acquaintance with the preaching of the historical Jesus, that in his own preaching to his Churches he could not have ignored the facts of the life of Jesus, and that he referred for rules of life to the words and example of Jesus (*ubi supra*, pp. 73, 82, 86, 130). Pfleiderer, however, in his recent criticism of Harnack, speaks of the 'surprising indifference' with which he hurries over the Pauline and Johannine theology, and declares that nowhere does Harnack give us a clear answer as to what constitutes 'uncorrupted Christianity' (*Development of Theology*, p. 299).

[2] See chap. i. p. 19.

[3] See chap. ii. p. 54.

CHAPTER III

RECENT ATTACKS UPON THE 'HAUPTBRIEFE

PART I

BEFORE we pass on to consider in detail the facts and sayings of the Gospels to which the Epistles bear witness, it must not be forgotten that modern criticism has refused to spare even the four chief Pauline Epistles. Until a few years ago it was an easy matter to appeal triumphantly to these four Epistles as writings admitted to be authentic even by the most remorseless critics,[1] but this is no longer possible, and we must not shut our eyes to the fact. English readers are already familiar with the name of the Dutch theologian Dr. Loman. But since the publication of Loman's attack, others of his countrymen have entered the lists against the Epistles; and more recently still, R. Steck, Professor in the University of Bern, and another Amsterdam Professor, Daniel Völter, have attacked them at length.[2]

[1] With the one notable exception of Bruno Bauer, *Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*, p. 1852. It is of interest and importance to bear in mind that whilst recent critics like Steck and Völter unhesitatingly condemn Bauer's eccentricities they do not hesitate to reproduce many of his arguments. Comp. *e.g.*, Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 62, 63, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, p. 45; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 57, 60, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, pp. 40, 41; Völter, *Die Komp. der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, pp. 8 ff., and Bauer, *ubi supra*, pp. 47 ff.; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 70, 71, and Bauer, p. 56; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 73, 136, 153, 154, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, pp. 67, 73; Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 167, and Bauer, p. 74; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 268 ff. and Bauer, *ubi supra*, p. 43 (zweite Abtheilung): Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 211, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, p. 47; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 206, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, pp. 61, 62; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 182, and Bauer, *ubi supra*, pp. 70, 71.

[2] *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*, by R. Steck, Berlin, 1888; *Die Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, by D. Völter, Tübingen, 1890. For an admirable skit upon these attacks of Steck and Völter, see *Romans Dissected*, p. 93, by E. D. McRealsham (T. and T. Clark, 1891). See Arch-

In an interesting article entitled 'The Epistles of Paul for the last fifty years in the fire of criticism,'[1] Theodor Zahn of Erlangen, whose name is so widely known in connection with the history of the Canon, after speaking of the early acceptance of the Pauline letters by the Church, points out that sixteen centuries had passed since Marcion's time before the authenticity of any one of the thirteen Pauline Epistles was seriously disputed. It is more than half a century ago (1888) that Michaelis published the last edition of his 'Introduction'; but his work (and that of Semler which had already appeared in Germany) was chiefly directed, Zahn reminds us, against the dogmatic obligation of the Scriptures, and against theories which regarded the Canon as a faultless production of Divine providence; it knew little or nothing, he adds, of the criticism of to-day. The next fifty years were not marked by any general critical movement in relation to the Pauline Epistles, although one or other of the writings bearing Paul's name was made the subject of inquiry or attack.

But matters changed when F. C. Baur turned his attention to these documents.

Ten years before his great work on St. Paul, Baur had in 1835 expressed his doubts as to the Pastoral Epistles ('Die

deacon Watkins' *Bampton Lectures*, p. 175, for the attack of the Englishman Evanson (1792) upon the Epistle to the Romans, and Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 230).

Völter's attack is examined at some length below, pp. 216 ff.

Amongst the most recent German criticism we may mention another attack upon the Epistle to the Galatians by J. Friedrich (Maehliss, 1891) entitled *Die Unechtheit des Galaterbriefes: ein Beitrag zu einer kritischen Geschichte des Urchristenthums*. The writer mentions that a considerable portion of his pamphlet was composed before he saw Steck's work (p. 39), but as a matter of fact he retails nearly all the same objections which Steck had raised, and all his later pages are simply a summary of Steck's arguments. He makes a great deal of the argument (p. 8) that 110 years lie between the supposed date of *Galatians*, 60, and the first testimony to its existence, which he places at 170. But, to say nothing of the fact that the latter date is quite out of the question, the writer entirely forgets that even if the interval was 110 years it would not be anything like as long as that which separates us from the first attestation of many classical writings which we unhesitatingly accept. See, e.g., *The Antiquity and Genuineness of the Gospels* (Allen), and Archdeacon Watkins' note in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 138, 139.

[1] 'Die Briefe des Paulus seit fünfzig Jahren im Feuer der Kritik,' in *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, p. 452–466, Heft ix. 1889.

sogen. Pastoralbriefe,' Stuttg. u. Tüb., 1835); in his 'Paulus,' as Zahn points out, he took up the position which he maintained to the end, and only admitted the four chief Epistles as belonging to Paul, and the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John: All the other writings of the New Testament were pseudepigraphic products of an historical development, which extended into the latter half of the second century, and the aim of which was to mediate between the legal Christianity of the primitive Apostles and the free Gospel preached by Paul. The development of Christianity and of Christian literature in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic age must be forced to obey the Hegelian formula of thesis, antithesis, and higher unity: whatever accords with the history thus interpreted is (continues Zahn) in Baur's view to be accepted; otherwise, however great its claim to be considered historical, it must be rejected, even though a more fitting place for it cannot be discovered.

That this criticism should have made a great impression in Germany is not, Zahn says, to be wondered at, when we remember how powerful the Hegelian philosophy still was; but it is a remarkable proof, he holds, of Baur's influence that men who are widely at variance with his conclusions should adopt a phraseology which implies that his distinction between the real and false Pauline letters corresponded with an actual historical development. Thus, B. Weiss in his 'Biblical Theology' treats separately of those writings of St. Paul which he calls 'the four great doctrinal and polemical Epistles,' viz. the four accepted by Baur. But can it be said, as Zahn puts it, that the eschatology of 1 Corinthians is more closely related to that of the Romans and Galatians than to that of the Thessalonian Epistles? or, is not the Epistle to the Ephesians quite as much a 'great' Epistle as the Galatians, and has it not a better claim than 2 Corinthians to the description of 'a doctrinal letter'?

After pointing out other serious objections to Baur's criticism, Zahn claims that Baur should be prepared to show why the critical grounds upon which he rejects nine Epistles may not equally be maintained against the four which he

receives. As far as external testimony is concerned—to say nothing of the fact that Baur and others like him always despise it—much less can be adduced for Galatians and 2 Corinthians than for Philippians and Ephesians. And if we turn to the grounds of internal testimony, Zahn points out that strange results would follow if we advocated upon similar grounds the rejection of the four accepted Epistles. In this connection Zahn reminds us of a former attempt of his own in which, starting from Baur's standpoint, he busied himself to prove that 1 Corinthians was not written by Paul.

The real Paul—so Zahn supposes the argument to run—says in Gal. v. 6 (cf. vi. 15), 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love.' How, then, can the same Paul have written 1 Corinthians, where we read (vii. 19), 'Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping the commandments of God'? is not this the plain old Catholic legality, the degenerate Paulinism of the post-Apostolic age, which appropriated Pauline turns of speech, but denied their spirit?

The Paul of the Galatians boasts that he had not received his gospel from men (Gal. i. 12); the Paul of 1 Cor. xv. 1–3, and xi. 23, has received his gospel, just as he has himself delivered it to the Corinthians, by human means and instruction. He does not appeal to the revelation of the Son of God made personally to him, but to the traditional words and commands of Jesus, and when this latter authority fails him, he is uncertain of his ground. And who can recognise the Paul of the Galatians who so boldly withstands Peter to his face, charges him with hypocrisy, and speaks only with irony of the very chiefest Apostles, in 1 Corinthians, the author of which places himself so far beneath the older Apostles, declares himself unworthy of the name of an Apostle, and shows himself entirely indifferent to the distinction between a Pauline and a Petrine gospel (1 Cor. xv. 9–11)? It is not the Paul of the Galatians, but the Paul of the Acts, who claims it as a merit that to the Jews he became as a Jew, and to them that are without law, as

without law (1 Cor. ix. 20, 21). If the same Paul only rebukes the partisans of Peter, who opposed Paul at Corinth, just as he rebukes those who formed the Paul-party in the same city, on account of their party spirit; if, indeed, he attacks the latter still more sharply and directly, since he exemplifies the folly of partisanship in connection with the name of Paul (1 Cor. i. 13)—who does not recognise in all this the same conciliatory tendency, levelling all the oppositions of the Apostolic age, which renders the Acts an untrustworthy book? Is not this the attitude of a man of Catholic spirit, utterly indifferent to all parties, such as that which characterises the pseudo-Paul of Phil. i. 18—'If only Christ is preached, whether in pretence or in truth, I do rejoice thereof'? It is true—so we may suppose this argument to run—that the pseudo-Paul is cautious enough to avoid in both passages the word 'catholic,' which confessedly first sprang into existence about the middle of the second century. But much more plainly even than in the exhortations to unity, and in the ever-recurring πάντες of the Philippian Epistle, is the idea of the 'Catholic' Church expressed in 1 Corinthians. Already Holsten ('Evangelium des Paulus,' i. 1, 453) has correctly recognised that the correct text and meaning of 1 Cor. i. 2, against which he in vain contends, is thoroughly 'catholic.' The one collective Church, standing above the particular Churches as the highest earthly authority, which the pseudo-Paul of the Philippians preaches, the critic finds in such passages as 1 Cor. x. 32, xii. 28; he finds it again where this pseudo-Paul demands the submission of the individual judgment to the uniform custom of all the Churches (1 Cor. iv. 17, vii. 17, xi. 16, xiv. 33). In short, so long as the Epistle to the Galatians is made the Archimedean point from which the traditional view of Apostolic Christianity is to be turned upside down, so long must each impartial judgment acknowledge that 1 Corinthians is only a link in the chain of pseudonymous literature, which forms the passage over the storm-tossed period of the Apostolic age to the peace of the Catholic Church. Such is the ingenious way in which Zahn shows that Baur's

line of attack might be extended much farther than he himself desired, and it will be seen that similar arguments to those which Zahn imagines have been actually reproduced in the recent opposition to the four great Epistles by Steck and Völter.

As Zahn reminds us, a reaction followed against Baur's views even in the ranks of his own followers. Not only, as we have seen, does Hilgenfeld accept more than one of the Epistles which Baur rejected, but a still more signal opposition was offered by one of the most famous of recent theologians, Albrecht Ritschl. His definite and fundamental breaking away from Baur's theory of the history of the Apostolic age (cf. Ritschl's 'Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche,' 2. Aufl. Bonn, 1857)[1] may fairly be called the most important event in the history of the contest with the Tübingen school.

There is no need to delay over 'the hypothesis of interpolations,'[2] as it may be called, with which the names of C. H. Weisse and F. Hitzig are associated. Such hypotheses are

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 13, 2. Aufl. 1889. For an appreciative notice of the importance of Ritschl's work see Archdeacon Watkins' *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 235, 242, 364, 1890. Pfleiderer seems quite unable to do justice to Ritschl (*Development of Theology*, pp. 235–237, 1890), whilst no one would suppose in reading the passing allusion to him in the 'New Reformation' (*Nineteenth Century*, p. 472, March 1889) that his 'scientific opposition' to the Tübingen school had been any opposition at all.

[2] 'Die Interpolationshypothese,' R. Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 8, Berlin, 1888. See also Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 159, 2. Aufl. 'Weisse hat seine Ansicht an den meisten der paulinischen Briefe durchgeführt und war überzeugt, das Richtige gefunden zu haben. Aber viel Anerkennung hat er damit nicht gefunden, sondern fast lediglich Widerspruch freilich letzteren auch mehr nur in der summarischen Weise, wie man die Ansichten Bruno Bauer's abgethan hatte. Seine Methode erschien gerade als die subjectivste von allen und man urtheilte über sie von den verschiedensten Seiten abfällig (vgl. z. B. Meyer-Sieffert im *Commentar zum Galaterbriefe*, 7. Aufl. p. 26: "Die zahlreichen Interpolationen, welche nach Weisse der apostolische Text erfahren haben soll, beruhen lediglich auf subjectiver Stylkritik mit völliger Hinwegsetzung über die kritischen Zeugen;" und Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, p. 192: "Ueber die Paulus-Briefe hat er seltsame, den Text zerreissende und zerstörende Ansichten hinterlassen in den *Beiträgen zur Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*," &c.) In der That gewinnt der Leser keine rechte Ueberzeugung davon, dass die von Weisse zurechtgestellten paulinischen Briefe nun ursprünglicher seien als die, welche wir jetzt lesen, und so blieb die ganze Absicht auf den engen Kreis seiner besonderen Schüler beschränkt' (R. Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 9, 10).

so entirely subjective that Weisse has been condemned by critics of very opposite tendencies, and Hitzig's chief distinction seems to be that he anticipated Holtzmann's theory of the mutual relations of the Colossian and Ephesian Epistles.[1] Even critics like Daniel Völter who have done their best to revive similar hypotheses are obliged to acknowledge the abeyance and discredit into which such views have fallen.[2]

With this interpolation-hypothesis Zahn connects the 'Verisimilia,' the joint work of two Dutch theologians, A. Pierson and S. A. Naber (1886).[3] It was the same year, as Zahn reminds us, which witnessed the ingenious attempt of a young Swiss theologian, Eberhard Vischer, to prove that the Johannine Apocalypse was a Jewish book, interpolated from Christian sources,[4] and so, adds Zahn with pardonable irony, one might be superstitious, and believe in a Time-Spirit to account for the remarkable coincidence that similar ideas should thus be evolved unconsciously and simultaneously, since Pierson and Naber take up the position that the Pauline Epistles also were compiled to a great extent out of Jewish writings.

In thus passing to a brief consideration of the 'Verisimilia,' the extraordinary attempt of Bruno Bauer in 1850–52, and again in 1876, to disprove, not only the whole of the Pauline Epistles, but the historical reality of Jesus Christ, has by no means been forgotten, but it seems naturally to connect itself with the similar radical attempt of Loman in 1882 (which will be considered in due course), just as we associate the

[1] After alluding to Weisse's theory, Zahn adds: 'Ueberraschte namentlich die Hypothese, dass ein echter Brief des Paulus an die Kolosser von einem und demselben Mann zuerst zur Grundlage des unechten Epheserbriefs gemacht, darauf aber auch noch selbst interpolirt und in den Kolosserbrief unseres Kanons umgearbeitet worden sei. Dass man diess Hypothese nicht nach ihrem Urheber, sondern nach H. J. Holtzmann zu benennen pflegt, hat lediglich darin seinen Grund, dass dieser bald darauf aus dem, was Hitzig auf elf Seiten gesagt hatte, ohne nennenswerthe Beimischung eignener Gedanken ein Buch von dreissigfachem Umfang hergestellt hat (1872).' *Ubi supra*, p. 458.

[2] *Die Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, i. p. 1. Tübingen, 1890.

[3] '*Verisimilia.* Laceram conditionem novi Testamenti illustrarunt et ab origine repetierunt A. Pierson et S. A. Naber.' Amsterdam u. Haag, 1886.

[4] E. Vischer, *Die Offenbarung Johannis eine jüdische Apokalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung.* Mit einem Nachwort von A. Harnack. 1886.

earlier interpolation-hypothesis with its later employment by the authors of the 'Verisimilia.'[1]

The two writers, Pierson and Naber, basing their extravagant theory upon an intimation of the younger Strabo, that the original Mosaism had degenerated into mere ritualism in the hands of self-seeking and superstitious priests, and upon the strength of an anecdote in Josephus,[2] suppose (according to Zahn's description of their work) that at the commencement of our era a spiritualised Judaism, free from all legal narrowness, had arisen, which in conscious opposition to Pharisaism had won many adherents in the heathen world, retaining the obligation of circumcision and the whole ceremonial law. Whole sections in the Pauline letters are almost literally the work of a clever and zealous missionary of this reformed Judaism, a very conscious 'Apostle of the Gentiles,' and they were already composed, it seems, in some degree in the form of letters to the Gentiles. These authors further suppose that a certain Christian ecclesiastic whom they name 'Paulus Episcopus' has appropriated large portions of these reformed Jewish writings to help his own poverty of ideas, and has Christianised them partly by making small changes, partly by large interpolations. It is therefore probable that the Epistles which bear the superscription 'Paul the Apostle' have for their author 'Paul the Bishop,' and that they are

[1] For Bruno Bauer's works see, especially, Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 4-8. Before his attack upon the Pauline Epistles Bruno Bauer had already assailed the historic character of the Gospels, and in contrasting his position with that of Strauss, Steck remarks: 'Das berühmste Leben Jesu, dass 1835 von Tübingen aus die Welt aufgeregt hatte, stellte zwar den Inhalt der evangelischen Erzählungen meistentheils als erdichtet dar, *liess aber doch die Geschichtlichkeit der von mythischer Umhüllung befreiten Person Jesu bestehen. Die Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte dagegen, wie der radicale Forscher sie trieb, zog die Existenz der Person Jesu überhaupt in Frage* (p. 5). Steck severely condemns Bauer's invidious tone and reckless criticism; he speaks of him as 'dieser verwegenste aller biblischen Kritiker,' and describes him as practically dead and forgotten. Cf. also Weiss, *Einleitung*, pp. 11 and 158.

For Bruno Bauer's sad and embittered career see Dr. A. S. Farrar's Bampton Lectures, *A Critical History of Free Thought*, p. 387. Zahn speaks of Bauer's views as finding no acceptance, and adds: 'Er galt für einen Mann, der durch Verbitterung die volle Zurechnungsfähigkeit eingebüsst habe' (*ubi supra*, pp. 461, 462).

[2] Josephus, *Arch.* xx. 2, 4.

Epistles actually addressed by him to existing Churches, in spite of their plagiarisms from reformed Jewish writings. (Cf. page 98: 'Hujusce nullam causam habuimus cur negaremus epistolas, quæ Pauli nomine feruntur, scriptas fuisse ad certas ecclesias et quidem ab Paulo episcopo'; the context shows that this remark applies to 1 and 2 Thess., Gal., 1 Cor 1–15.) All that they contain of rich and spiritual ideas, of greatness and boldness, is the work of the nameless reformed Jew; all that is mean and timid, priestly and apologetic, is to be put down to the poor Bishop Paul. We are next asked to believe that this Paul had composed other missives which we no longer possess as a whole; and as the Jewish supply was exhausted, further Epistles of Paul—*e.g.* 2 Cor.—were composed out of these works of Paul the Bishop and other writers of his stamp, with the help of written Church documents. Thus, from this strange medley, our collection of Pauline Epistles was made, and that, too, at a very early date (Romans, *e.g.*, is placed about 60 A.D., p. 294).

But this apparently conservative tendency with regard to the date of the composition of the Epistles cannot deceive us, says Zahn, as to the real aim of the 'Verisimilia.'[1] Just as the *Carthago delenda* of the last generation was the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, so that of the present is the proposition which affirms: *Evangelii prima initia in Novo Testamento exponuntur.*

But, as Zahn points out, only that has the appearance of truth (*verisimilia*) which bears a certain resemblance to some reality which we know; and, to effect their object, Pierson and his colleague should have examined the improbabilities of earlier views, and not hazarded bold conjectures and opinions

[1] 'Wenn somit auscheinend in Betreff der Abfassungszeit der paulinischen Briefe eine ziemlich conservative Stellung eingehalten wird, so wird doch Niemand sich darüber täuschen können, dass in Wirklichkeit alle bisherigen Grundlagen der Erklärung des neuen Testaments verschoben und unsicher gemacht sind. Nach der einen Seite hin ist in den *Verisimilia* das Erklärungsprincip auf das ganze neue Testament ausgedehnt, das unlängst Vischer mit Glück an der Apokalypse versucht hat: eine jüdische Grundlage, von christlicher Hand überarbeitet. Andererseits wird die Weisse'sche Interpolationstheorie in noch umfassenderen Masse an den neutestamentlichen Schriften durchgeführt' (Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 20).

mutually exclusive. The Apostle Paul as he is presented to us in the Epistles has according to Pierson and Naber no existence. Their author is indeed called Paul; he names himself—so it appears—an Apostle, in imitation of a Jewish missionary, and an Apostle directly called by God and Christ; he addresses the Churches of Thessalonica, of Corinth, of Galatia, as their founder, but he is manifestly nothing of the kind—he is a Bishop. And we have to believe (as Zahn points out) that the Churches scattered throughout Asia and Europe, with whom he placed himself in correspondence—just as did Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, a hundred years later—received all this as if a reality lay at the foundation of these proud Apostolic words! But according to Pierson and Naber, the Paul of the Acts is also unhistorical, although he is more akin to reality than the Paul of the Epistles, and is certainly not derived from him: they even think it not improbable that the actual Paul the Bishop was the model for this fanciful personage of the Acts ('Verisimilia,' p. 190). We are, accordingly, says Zahn, not only called upon to believe that this weak-headed Bishop decked himself out for an Apostle in his letters with Jewish feathers, and so gained an entrance into Churches of which he was neither an Apostle nor the Bishop, but that some one else, who knew him, but not his letters, has played the same kind of trick with his personality, and produced the Paul of the Acts.

If we ask upon what grounds all this inconceivable procedure is recommended to our view as probable, we are told that the reason is to be found in the unintelligible, disconnected, contradictory matter of the Epistles: they must therefore be compilations. The positive assertion that their foundation is of Jewish origin is based, Zahn reminds us, upon one single observation. It is senseless, according to Pierson and Naber, for Paul to write of the Jews that they both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and had persecuted him and his companions, forbidding them to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16): only Jewish Christians, but not Jews, would have grudged the gospel to the heathen, for this presupposes that they had regarded the

gospel as a means of salvation. Here, therefore, we have (according to the 'Verisimilia,' p. 10 &c.) a reforming Jewish missionary, speaking of the opposition of the Pharisaic Jews in Palestine against his endeavours.

But this criticism, says Zahn, overlooks the fact that, if such an argument is true, these Pharisaic Jews must have regarded the reformed Judaism preached by their opponents, without circumcision, Sabbath, or sacrifice, as a saving truth which they did not permit to the Gentiles. It overlooks the fact that the Paul of the Acts, who, in its judgment, is an imitation of the real Paul Episcopus, had everywhere to do with Jews (just as the Paul of the Epistles) who everywhere hindered the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles. It overlooks, moreover, this circumstance, viz. that according to many witnesses of the second and third centuries, the Jews were the chief instigators of Gentile populations and magistrates against the Christians, not because they envied the heathen the gospel, but out of hatred against the new religion, which had taken possession of the ground where formerly Jews had gained proselytes.

Such criticism cannot expect to win many adherents; but it is to be noted, as Zahn reminds us in passing, that the critics of another stamp, who in Germany and Holland shake their heads and turn their backs upon such fantasies, must allow that the methods and the means by which Pierson and Naber arrive at their 'probabilities' have a striking likeness to those which both they and their predecessors have employed.

It is hardly by chance, in Zahn's opinion, that the very same passage (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16) upon which Pierson and Naber have hung their whole web of hypotheses was claimed by Baur as a decisive proof against the authenticity of the Epistle, because in the place of the opposition to the Judaising Christianity, which the real Paul opposes, we find a vague polemic against the Jews. In both cases we have the same bold deductions from their own misunderstanding, the same disregard of early testimony, the same inability to demonstrate how with any probability the falsifications, interpolations and

compilations could have found an entrance into Churches which had received the writings in question as genuine letters of their founder. On the whole, it is not surprising that Pierson and Naber had no following.[1]

We find it constantly asserted that the early Church had no critical discernment, that forgeries easily won their way into acceptance, and that we must carefully guard ourselves against transferring our own moral judgments on truth and fiction to an age so unlike the century in which we live. But are we so sure that such a picture of the early Church is a true one? May we not reasonably prefer the description set forth in a few words by Dr. Weiss?—'How earnestly the Church took care to guard against the admixture of anything spurious is proved by the example of that Asiatic presbyter who composed the 'Acta Pauli et Theclæ,' and although he asserted that his motive was love to Paul, was nevertheless deposed (Tertullian, "De Bapt." 17).'[2]

In the year in which Bruno Bauer died, 1882, the Dutch theologian A. D. Loman, commenced his series of 'Quæstiones Paulinæ,' which led, although by a different route, to the

[1] For an interesting account of Pierson and Naber and their works, Steck's chapter in his *Galaterbrief* entitled 'Der Stand der Frage,' to which reference has already been made, may be consulted. 'Ueber das ganze der *Verisimilia* hat die niederländische Theologie durch den Mund einiger berufener Vertreter (Kuenen, "Verisimilia"? *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1886, S. 491–536; Prins, "De Brief aan de Galatiërs in Tegenspraak met sich zelven gebracht," ebenda, 1887, S. 65–91) bereits sein Urtheil abgegeben, und dieses Urtheil ist nicht gerade zu ihren Gunsten ausgefallen' (Steck, *in loco* p. 20).

No criticism could be more sarcastic or more destructive than that of W. C. van Manen in his article 'Paulus Episcopus,' directed against Pierson and Naber's theory (see *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, pp. 395 ff. 1887). Unfortunately, van Manen has since adopted a position in comparison with which even Steck's may be called conservative (Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 16–18, 1890).

[2] 'Die Kirche die ihrigen keineswegs erst aus schriftlichen Denkmälern abgeleitet hatte, sondern aus einer lebendigen mündlichen Ueberlieferung, die ihr vielmehr der Massstab wurde für Alles, was sich als echtes Schriftdenkmal der Apostelzeit ausgeben wollte. *Und wie ernstlich die Kirche darüber wachte, dass nicht Unechtes unter dieselben eingemischt wurde, zeigt das Beispiel jenes asiatischen Presbyters, der die "Acta Pauli et Theclæ" verfasst hatte und doch, obwohl er aus Liebe zu Paulus gethan zu haben behauptete, abgesetzt wurde*' (Tert. *De Bapt.* 17).' Weiss, *Einleitung*, 2. Aufl. p. 61.

same negative conclusions as had been arrived at by Bauer.[1]

Loman had first enunciated his views on the oldest form of Christianity at a conference of the Free Churches held at Amsterdam in the previous year, 1881. At the outset he reminded the audience of our ignorance of the subject which he had chosen to discuss, since neither the four canonical nor the four modern Evangelists, Strauss, Keim, Hausrath, and Renan, had given us correct information. Baur, according to Loman, had proved that the fourth Gospel was a product of the middle of the second century; the Synoptic question can never be said to be settled, whilst the Pauline Epistles and the Acts—with the exception of the *Hauptbriefe*—are more and more relegated to the middle of the second century.

How, then, asks Loman, can we trust the traditional account of the earliest Christianity? We cannot say that because Christianity exists, much of the description of its origin which we have met with is correct. The Gospel narratives may be all fictitious—they are certainly full of contradictions. The personality of Jesus, as we have received it by tradition, has nothing clear or definite about it; and in addition to all this, we have no information from Jewish writers, not even Flavius Josephus, since the only passage which seems to prove the opposite has been interpolated by Christians. Tacitus and Suetonius, the earliest heathen historians who give us any information, describe Christianity as a purely Jewish movement.[2]

To remove these difficulties, Loman puts forward a suggestion to the effect that Christianity was nothing else than a Messianic movement amongst the Jews—Jesus of Nazareth never existed. He is not the embodiment of one idea, but of

[1] 'Br. Bauer's Idee sollte also nicht mit ihm sterben. Man darf vermuthen, dass sie in allen europäischen Sprachen wird gepredigt werden. Pierson und Naber, welche bei aller Selbständigkeit ihres Ideenganges doch in Bezug auf die *Carthago delenda* mit Br. Bauer einig sind, schreiben lateinisch, und zwar, abgesehen von einigen wunderlichen Schreib- oder Druckfehlern, ein ganz munteres Latein Loman schrieb holländisch' (Zahn, *ubi supra*, p. 462).

[2] The following account of Loman's views, and those of Scholten and others, is closely derived from W. C. van Manen's article in the *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, pp. 593-618.

a whole series of ideas, the symbol and personification of thoughts and principles which were fully developed in the second century of the Christian era—the ideal son of the Jewish nation—the suffering Messiah, the Servant of God, who is risen out of his lowliness into a state of glory—a glory first realised after the Temple and Jerusalem itself had been devastated by the Romans, and Israel 'after the flesh' had perished, only to rise from the dead, to be baptised with a new name, Christianity.

Thus Loman thinks to get rid of the above-mentioned difficulties: but the great stumbling-block is the supposed authenticity of the four chief Epistles of Paul. But are these Epistles really genuine? Professor Loman returns a negative answer in the 'Theologisch Tijdschrift' for 1882, 1883. He begins his 'Quæstiones Paulinæ,' the title given to his articles, with a Prolegomena, in which he insists upon the necessity of revising the basis of our knowledge of the original Paulinism. The Paul of the Epistles is a psychological enigma, if we think of him as removed from Jesus by such a short space of time. In such a case, we could only explain the rise of the Christian Church by actual miracle, with Keim, or by a psychological miracle, with Baur. But this is not possible. Renan's representation is equally unsatisfactory, and we begin to doubt whether he himself believes in his 'sweet Jesus,' or his 'incomparable Apostle.' We must therefore, says Loman, justify our own belief in the historical reality of these two—Jesus and Paul. They are no longer for us what they once were. Can we say, after exact inquiry, that one single detail of the old representations of their lives is left to us? The Christ of the Epistles does not resemble the Jesus of the Synoptists; the distinctive Christian life of the Church, and the rich theology, which form the background of the Epistles, justify the hypothesis that these writings are of later date.[1] Loman recognises that there were good elements even in B. Bauer's criticism, although he is obliged to confess that it was too one-sided and subjective to gain much assent; and he acknowledges that Pierson's doubts with regard to the Epistle

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, p. 597.

to the Galatians, although not completely convincing in themselves, brought him to be sceptical as to the genuineness of the four great Epistles. Why have not others attained the same point of view? Because, says Loman, they have always proceeded from the assumption that Paul was quite an extraordinary man. This mistaken idea must be laid aside. There is no danger to our Christian belief, or to Christian science in this—our knowledge will only be widened. Loman commences with the Galatians, which is, according to almost universal opinion, the oldest Christian writing which we possess. In his view the criticism of the Tübingen school which started from the axiom of the authenticity of this Epistle no longer suffices. If that criticism is correct, we must regard the author of the Acts as a man who knew the Pauline letters, regarded their author as a real Apostle of Jesus, and nevertheless intentionally altered the original pictures of Paul and Paulinism. The Paul of the Acts is an impossible Paul, an unpractical 'radical,' an idol, a deity, whose personality and activity cannot be explained like those of other men. But the task of the critic of to-day needs finer gifts and more delicate instruments than those at the service of our predecessors: we stand on their shoulders and see further. We can no longer hold one-sidedly to the opinion that discrepancies between the Galatians and the Acts can be explained by the tendency of the Acts designedly to change the history, or by supposing that Luke was by some chance circumstance unacquainted with the Pauline Epistles. The simpler and more natural explanation is that Luke did not use the Epistles, because they did not originate from Paul, but were forged in his name. They represented a higher, and so, in all probability, a younger phase of Christian life and thought than that of the Acts: they stand to this book in somewhat the same relation as St. John's Gospel to the Synoptists.[1] How, then, did the Epistles which bear the name of Paul originate? According to Loman, who summarily dismisses the view that they were known either to Marcion or Justin, they were the product of the Anti-Judaic and universalistic Gnosis of the early part of the second

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, p. 597.

century. The chiefs of this movement could not appeal to the Twelve, whose Jewish sympathies were well known ; and so, about 120 A.D. they determined to make Paul, or Saul of Tarsus, their hero, whose history, with the exception of some few incidents, is entirely lost to us. Thus the Paul-legend, says Loman, arose in the interests of the true Gnosis, *i.e.* in the interests of the spread of a universalistic Christianity. Epistles were written in Paul's name to recommend this Christianity : first, the Romans, equally inoffensive to the Jews and to Peter ; then 1 Corinthians, wherein the equal rights of Peter, Apollos, and Paul were defended ; next, 2 Corinthians, which presupposes a sharper opposition on the part of the Jews, so that Paul must take his stand against the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι ; lastly, the Galatians, wherein the Apostle of the Gentiles in his full greatness, and perfectly emancipated, stands opposed to the so-called ' pillar ' Apostles, and represents the Apostle of the circumcision as a condemned deceiver.[1]

According to van Manen's summary of Loman's views, the matter stood thus : Paul was in fact the man who Hellenised Christianity through his zealous propaganda in the interests of the Messianic movement in the Syrian Diaspora, in Asia Minor, in Greece, in Rome. Yet long after the year 70 did the original Jewish Messianic idea break loose from the national Judaism and transform itself into the universal humanistic idea of Christ as the Son of God in the anti-legal sense, which we see developed by the author of the Galatians. In the neutralisation of Jewish legalism, and in the expulsion of the national element, which was originally inseparable from the Messianic idea, there lay the fundamental thought of the Gnosis which governed the theology of the second century. The whole Pauline literature, including Luke's Gospel and the Acts, is a product of this post-Apostolic Gnosis.

Here Loman breaks off, not, we may suppose, without some intention of continuing his task in a more substantial way. It may be noted in passing that it is not correct to say, as has sometimes been alleged, that Loman denies Paul's existence. He admits that there was such a person as Paul, or

[1] *Jahr ücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, pp. 603, 604.

Saul of Tarsus, and that some details of his life and work were known in the early Church. What he does deny is the existence of the canonical Paul, the author of the Epistles which in the New Testament Canon bear his name.

In general, as van Manen tells us, the judgment on Loman's hypothesis was certainly not favourable. In the usual annual meeting of theologians which was held at Amsterdam in April 1882, and was attended by some 160 persons, amongst whom was Loman, no one declared himself in favour of the hypothesis when it was proposed in this form: 'What is to be thought of the symbolical conception of the Person of Jesus in connection with the rise of Christianity?' Amongst others (to continue van Manen's description) who expressed themselves against Loman's theory, Dr. Knappert pointed to the age of the Synoptic Gospels, which did not leave sufficient time to explain the transformation of a symbolic conception into an historic person; to the early rise of the Church founded on the belief in the Resurrection, a belief which presupposed an antecedent life, which could not have been invented in such a brief space of time. Prof. A. Kuenen remarked that the blending of the suffering righteous One with the Messiah was very natural as a result of the suffering and death of Jesus, but that it remains an insoluble puzzle if no Jesus had ever existed; and both he and other speakers were of opinion that a symbolical conception of Jesus takes too little account of the significance of the personality which everywhere in the Gospel history must be considered an important factor.

Loman, in his answer, contended that his inquiry was pursued, not out of hostility, but out of love to Christianity; and that it was the natural result of all which had preceded it. The rationalistic conception of Jesus is laid aside; the symbolic is to succeed it. In the last hundred years criticism had accomplished nothing for the history of the life of Jesus. The Synoptists, who date from somewhere about the middle of the second century, so represent Him that we can only say 'He is a symbolic figure.' The word 'Christianity' signifies a religion which has gone through all kinds of difficult phases

in the course of centuries, and which cannot be explained from a single cause or a single Person.[1]

But later, J. van Zoon openly supported Loman in writing, and expressed agreement with his endeavour to lead us through the symbolic conception to a higher standpoint instead of the modern rationalism of Strauss, Renan, and Keim, just as Strauss himself had overcome the older rationalism. Before all, also, he laid emphasis upon the fact that both Gospels and Epistles point us to a Christ of a metaphysical and supernatural character, for which modern thought finds no place in the history. To assume that Jesus is an historical Person is, in his opinion, to avail oneself of an hypothesis equally with Professor Loman.[2]

The debate in writing, van Manen tells us, had been already commenced by Dr. Rovers, who proved chiefly that Loman was not justified in appealing to Josephus. He pointed out that the passage ('Ant.' xviii. 3, 3) where Josephus speaks of Jesus, His miracles and Resurrection, is by no competent judge considered entirely genuine. But why, he asks, does not Loman mention 'Ant.' xx. 9? There Josephus speaks of James the brother of Jesus who was called Christ. His silence about Christianity, if he had known of it, is very easily explainable, considering his position as a Pharisee, the friend of the Romans. The fact that he mentions John the Baptist, the reputed Forerunner of Jesus, after the account of the recall of Pilate, does not prove that he placed the appearance of the Baptist after the year 36. Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny, and Lucian, no doubt relate very little concerning Christianity, but there is nothing on which to base the opinion that it was originally a purely Jewish national movement. Equally little can such a supposition be proved from the name Christ, 'Messiah.' The fourth Evangelist, who had broken with Jews and Judaism, avails himself of the same title, and so does Paul, who boasts himself to be a Hebrew, an Israelite of the seed of Abraham. Suetonius speaks of 'Chrestus,' in which Loman thinks he recognises 'Christ.' Tacitus relates that the founder of

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, pp. 605, 606. [2] *Ibid.* p. 607.

Christianity was put to death by Pilate in the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, and so before 36, when the governor was deposed. If this testimony is trustworthy, Jesus was an historical Person. (Pierson in his earlier work 'De Bergrede en andere Synoptische Fragmenten,' pp. 87 ff., actually spoke of this testimony of Tacitus, as well as that of Pliny concerning the Christians, as an interpolation.)[1]

But Kuenen was not the only advanced critic who openly expressed his dissent from Loman's theory. Dr. Scholten, another Dutch theologian, wrote a special work in reply to Loman, the first part of which had previously appeared in the 'Theologisch Tijdschrift' (1882 pp. 428–451) under the title 'Flavius Josephus and Jesus.' The silence of Josephus, argues Scholten, is no proof that Jesus never existed. Josephus also says nothing of the Christian Church, with which he must have come into contact in Rome after 63 A.D., and the existence of which no one doubts. The Jerusalem Church may have been too insignificant in his eyes to deserve mention. Nor was there anything of special interest for him in the stories circulated about Jesus. The report of His resurrection rested upon a subjective belief: His powers of healing the sick were shared by others: His preaching, welcome to the poor of this world, had nothing attractive for the aristocracy: and His appearance and crucifixion at Jerusalem were matters of little weight in the eyes of an historian who saw no permanent results from them.[2]

But, in Scholten's view, it is untrue to allege that Josephus does not know of Jesus. He mentions Him ('Ant.' xviii. 3, 3) in a passage which is no doubt interpolated, but which is not entirely fictitious, and probably in its original form ran thus: Γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς, σοφὸς ἀνήρ· ἦν γὰρ παραδόξων ἔργων ποιητής· καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους, πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ ἐπηγάγετο. Καὶ αὐτὸν ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν σταυρῷ ἐπιτετιμηκότος Πιλάτου, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο [ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν] οἵ γε πρῶτον αὐτὸν

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, p. 608.

[2] *Ibid.* On the silence of Josephus see Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, i. 374; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 66.

ἀγαπήσαντες. . . . Εἰσέτι τε νῦν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὠνομασμένων οὐκ ἐπέλιπε τὸ φῦλον. Moreover, Josephus speaks of the murder of the ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ ('Ant.' xx. 9, 1). Scholten therefore concludes that what Loman calls 'the symbolical conception' finds no support from Josephus;[1] and whether we accept his readings of the two passages which he cites or not, they at least show how entirely an extreme radical critic like Scholten is opposed to the extravagant views of Loman and similar writers.

But by far the greater part of Scholten's work is concerned with the authenticity of the Pauline *Hauptbriefe*. He points out that the Acts in the narrative of Stephen and Cornelius presuppose a universalism as much as the Epistles. From several points it is apparent that the author of the Acts communicates accounts of Paul which partly are in entire agreement with the accounts given in the Epistles, and partly are only intelligible by a knowledge of the Epistles, and by the belief that the Paul which they represent is the true and original Paul. Scholten next reminds his readers that he had already shown in a previous work ('Das Paulinische Evangelium') that the Gospel according to Luke favours a conception of Christianity in harmony with the Paulinism of the four great Epistles, and he draws attention to some expressions and thoughts in Luke which appear to be derived from those Epistles.

When he turns to the other books of the New Testament, it is certainly difficult to find, as Scholten supposes, allusions to Paul, and hostility to his doctrines, in such expressions as ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, Matt. xiii. 25, 28 ('an enemy' in the parable of the tares and the wheat), or in such passages as Matt. v, 18, 19, vii. 6, 15, xxii. 11–14, xxviii. 19; but it will be noticed that Scholten not only assigns an earlier date to the Epistle of James and to the first Epistle of Peter (in both of which he finds a recognition of Pauline Epistles) than many representatives of the modern critical school, but that he refuses to share in the doubts raised by Völter against the

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, p. 609.

unity of the Apocalypse, which he places in 68 or 69 A.D., although he maintains the position of the early Tübingen school, and traces in its pages attacks upon the adherents of Paul (ch. ii. 14, 20, cf. 1 Cor. vii. 12, viii. 1, and Rom. xiv. 1, 17–20; ch. ii. 2, 9, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2, Rom. ii. 28, 29, Gal. vi. 16). Scholten can therefore describe the Apocalypse as a book which, written within a few years of Paul's death, remains one of the strongest bulwarks of the belief in the early existence of Pauline modes of thought. So, too, in Scholten's opinion, the Epistle to the Hebrews—which he admits was probably written by Apollos about 66 A.D.—evidently presupposes in its form and spirit the historical reality of the Paul of the four great Epistles.[1]

In dealing with some of Loman's other arguments, Scholten maintains that the silence of the Church Father Justin Martyr cannot be taken as a proof that the Pauline Epistles were not in existence in the middle of the second century—so far as Justin is concerned, his silence as to the Epistles may be readily explained by his aversion to Paul: the fact that Marcion admitted letters which were not genuine amongst his ten Pauline Epistles only proves that such letters were in existence in his day (about 140 A.D.); the objection against the Epistle to the Romans founded upon its alleged use of the 'Assumptio Mosis' in ch. ii. 15 is removed when one considers that there can be no question here of such employment, which in itself would be extremely improbable owing to the strong Judaic character of the source in question. Scholten therefore concludes that there is no fair reason, on the ground of external testimony, to doubt the historical existence of the Paul of the four great Epistles, and that the late origin which Loman ascribes to these documents is an utter impossibility.

In opposition to the opinion that the Paulinism of these four Epistles can be better explained as the result than as the starting-point of the developed Christianity which meets us in the middle of the second century, Scholten expresses his conviction that this Paulinism did not take its rise within the limits of Judaism, and that it could only be the production

[1] *Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* 1883, p. 610.

of an original powerful spirit, which had learnt, in its independence and freedom, to recognise in the cross of Jesus the revelation of a might that overcometh the world, and in His resurrection, not merely a vindication of the Nazarene rejected by the Jews, but the triumph of life over death, and the pathway to glory. Paul, a man endowed with most original talent, grasped the idea of a world-wide religion, which, while Jesus lived, still lay concealed in swaddling-clothes. But Paul's endeavour could not at once attain success: a long course of years has often to elapse before a creative genius is recognised in all its value.

We have thus dwelt at length upon Scholten's attitude with regard to Loman's theory, because his name is more representative, and better known in England, than that of many of his countrymen. But it is not to be wondered at that other Dutch professors should have taken occasion to point out to their students the out-and-out sceptical, partial, and prejudiced character of Loman's criticism.

These attacks called forth replies from Dr. Loman, and he admits in answer to Scholten's attack, that he ought not to have appealed to Josephus, and that his doubts with regard to the unity and late origin of the Apocalypse were without sufficient foundation. In other respects he explains that Scholten has misunderstood him, although some of his explanations may not unfairly be viewed as concessions. With regard to the symbolical conception of the Person of Jesus, Loman maintains that the canonical Paul may perhaps be quoted in its favour, who will know nothing of the historical Christ 'after the flesh,' and who stands in this respect above the older tradition which relates details of an historical Jesus. We moderns, in Loman's view, know nothing of the historical Jesus, or as good as nothing, and we wish to know nothing of the Christ 'after the flesh,' but we must not take up a position which implies that the case was otherwise. It is possible, he admits, that characteristics and details which the Evangelists have attributed to Jesus of Nazareth were once united in a living Person in Palestine—yet all that can be known historically of such a Person does not suffice to

stamp Him as the founder of a new and all-embracing religious movement. On the other hand, all is naturally and easily explained if we see in the oldest Evangelical narratives the reminiscences, with their Messianic colouring, of the distressing period marked by the bloody tragedy enacted at Jerusalem and Rome; and if in the Jesus combined with the Christ-Figure we recognise the embodiment and symbol of the piety and prophetic enthusiasm, of the heroism and endurance of the saint and the martyr, and above all, of the invisible might and indubitable triumph, assured to the steadfast Friend of God.[1]

PART II

BUT a much more serious attack than that of Bauer or Pierson was made upon the *Hauptbriefe* in 1886 by R. Steck, Professor of Theology in the University of Bern.[2] In his preface, Steck explains how he came to make his attempt to transfer the four Epistles to 120–140 A.D. Difficulties which he met in the Galatians led to the view that this Epistle ought not to occupy the first place, but that it was dependent on the other three Epistles. It therefore became necessary for Steck to extend his examination to Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, with the result that, in his opinion,

[1] Comp., however, Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 68 ff. 1887; Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 192, 193, 2. Aufl. 1886. Holtzmann, in describing the position here taken up by Loman, remarks that it was rejected even within the camp of critical theologians.

[2] *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht.* Rudolf Steck. Berlin, 1888.

'Ehe ich an die Prüfung der Beweise herantrete, wodurch Steck dies zu beweisen denkt, muss ich bekennen, dass das Buch dieses berner Professors im Vergleich mit dem Satyrspiel der *Verisimilia* und manchen Leistungen der deutschen Kritik seit F. Chr. Baurs Hingang mir einen recht ernsthaften Eindruck macht. Der Verfasser glaubt, was er sagt; und er sagt es gerade heraus, ohne Rücksicht auf den Beifall der Recensenten, welche bei uns die öffentliche Meinung machen. Er enthält sich ebenso sehr des hohlen Pathos, als der journalistischen Phrase, deren abwechselnde Anwendung heute die Streber zum Ziel führt. Um so beklagenswerther erscheint es mir, dass dieser ehrliche Mann nichts Besseres zu sagen weiss' (Zahn, *ubi supra*, p. 462; comp. Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik der Galaterbrief*, p. 3).

they are no longer to be ascribed to the historical Paul of the Acts, but to be regarded as the product of the second century, the work of a Pauline party striving for supremacy; and in chronological order they stand thus: Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians.[1]

It is rather a cause of rejoicing, from Steck's point of view, that the Pauline Epistles will now lose the imposing position which they claimed as the earliest sources of our knowledge of Christianity: they must now yield the first place to the Synoptists and the Acts—not that these latter books contain a trustworthy history of Jesus and the Apostles, but that they contain at any rate some genuine words of the Master, and an Apostolic preaching resembling them. One can now confidently turn back from the artificial theories of atonement and justification propounded by Paul, partly derived from legal sources, partly from the Old Testament, to the simple form of free justification which lies in the words of Jesus. The older Protestantism was based upon the theories of Paul; the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth is to be the foundation of the new.[2]

Certainly Steck may be said to have the courage of his convictions, and he does not hesitate to face the results of his own theory. Of the two pillars upon which the Tübingen school based their view of early Church history, one, the Apocalypse, has been weakened; the other, the four great Pauline Epistles, must share the same fate, if Steck's reasoning is valid ('Der Galaterbrief,' p. 23).

But what are the grounds upon which Steck bases his conclusions? In the earlier part of his work we have a lengthy examination of discrepancies, upon which he insists, between the Galatians and the Acts. Here, at the outset, we notice a remarkable difference between his standpoint and

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 357–67, 373; comp. 152–63, on the correct order of the four *Hauptbriefe*.

[2] Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 385, 386. Zahn, after commenting upon the result at which Steck thus arrives, concludes his article, 'Neu ist das jedenfalls nicht. Vom wahren Evangelium Christi und vom echten Christenthum der Evangelien haben schon vor bald 150 Jahren englische Deisten geredet. Der Umweg aber, auf welchem man dabei wieder angelangt ist, erscheint ein wenig weitläufig' (*ubi supra*, p. 466).

that of the early Tübingen school. The Epistle to the Galatians, which Baur accepted and which served him as a basis for his elaborate theory of a fundamental opposition between Paul and the Twelve, is now rejected: the Acts of the Apostles, although a later source with an eirenic 'tendency,' is not so artificial and so utterly untrustworthy as the historical setting of the Galatian Epistle.[1] Dr. Weiss, who, in the second edition of his 'Introduction,' refers to Steck as treading in the steps of B. Bauer,[2] has rightly laid stress upon this change of front in the criticism of the Acts of the Apostles, and upon the contradictory attitude towards other advanced critics which Steck is obliged to assume in his eagerness to do it honour.[3]

[1] Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 80.

[2] 'Die allen geschichtlichen Boden aufhebende Kritik Bruno Bauers, der alle paulinische Briefe für erdichtet erklärte (*Kritik der paulinischen Briefe*, Berlin, 1850), hat neuerdings wieder unter den holländischen Kritikern, besonders in Loman (*Quæstiones Paulinæ*; vgl. van Manen in den *Jahrb. für protest. Theol.* 1883–7), Nachfolger gefunden, und soeben hat R. Steck in Bern (*Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*, Berlin, 1881) dieselben Wege betreten' (Weiss, *Einleitung*, i. 158, 2. Aufl. 1889).

With this we may compare Steck's own remarks (*Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 77, 78, 103, 112, 119, 137, &c.)

[3] Weizsäcker, *e.g.*, makes the author of the Acts dependent upon the author of the Galatian Epistle, whilst Steck reverses the relationship of dependence.

'Wie durch die neueste radikale Kritik der Paulusbriefe (vgl. Steck, *Galaterbrief*) die Geschichtlichkeit der Apostelgeschichte wieder zu Ehren kommt, haben wir (S. 14) gesehen' (Weiss, *Einleitung*, 2. Aufl. p. 569; see also the whole of note 7 on the same page). 'Während in neuester Zeit Volkmar (*Paulus von Damaskus bis zum Galaterbriefe*, Zürich, 1887) die Darstellung in Act. xv. für eine reine Phantasie erklärt, welche der Verf. der richtigen Darstellung seiner Quelle substituirt habe, bemuht sich Steck (*Der Galaterbrief*, Berlin, 1888) im Interesse seiner Unechterklärung des Galaterbriefs die Darstellung desselben als eine durchweg unwahrscheinliche, idealistisch gefärbte zu erweisen, der gegenüber die der Apostelgeschichte immer noch die relative Geschichtlichkeit für sich habe. Während Weizsäcker den Verf. der Apostelgeschichte vom Galaterbrief abhängig sein lässt, nimmt er das umgekehrte Verhältniss an' (Weiss, *ibid.* p. 142). For Steck's view of the relative historicity of the Galatians and the other Pauline Epistles, and the value of the Acts, see *Galaterbrief*, pp. 78–81. 'Es ist und bleibt also die Apostelgeschichte ein unschätzbares Buch, dessen Werth auch durch die unhistorischen Elemente der Darstellung nicht aufgehoben werden kann' (pp. 80–1). It is thus that Steck praises the book against which the Tübingen school directed their sharpest criticism; without it, in his opinion, we could not possibly form any coherent view of the early development of the Christian Church; it supplies all the scaffolding of the historical superstructure, and critics must depend upon it for their choice of materials; apart from it, we should possess no exact information

But further, it is a well-known fact that many representatives of the modern critical school have modified their view of the fundamental opposition between Paul and the Twelve, and nothing could be more emphatic than their statements that a partition of labour between Paul and the original Apostles was the historical result of the relations described in the Acts and in the Galatians.[1]

But in Steck's judgment there is an utterly irreconcileable difference between Galatians and Acts. A partition of labour between Paul and the Twelve, whether ethnographical or geographical is quite inconceivable [2]—the position and charac-

as to the Pauline missionary journeys, and the beginning and end of the Apostle's life would be lost in darkness; and it remains an invaluable book, the worth of which cannot be destroyed even by the unhistorical elements that it contains. 'Während die tübinger Schule die ganze Schärfe ihrer Kritik gegen die Apostelgeschichte richtete, ist der neue Kritiker überzeugt, dass die Mittheilungen der Apostelgeschichte über Paulus Leben und Wirken in der Hauptsache zuverlässig seien, dass dagegen in dem Galaterbrief ein Idealbild von dem Apostel und seiner Verkündigung entworfen werde, das unmöglich der Wirklichkeit entsprechen könne.' Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, 1890, p. 6; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 641, 2nd edit. 1890.

[1] See the whole account of Weiss as to the connection between Acts xv. and Gal. ii., *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 133–42, 2. Aufl. 1889; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. ix–xii and 103 ff.; Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, pp. 42–6, 1889; Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften N. T.* p. 134; 6. Aufl. 1887; on the conservative side, Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 165 ff. 3. Aufl. 1885. Comp., too, the remarkable articles of Pfleiderer, considering the standpoint of the writer, in the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1883, entitled 'Paulinische Studien.' See *e.g.* 2, *Der Apostelkonvent*, pp. 242–62, in which he argues for the main agreement of the incidents in Acts xv. and Gal. ii. 1–10, and quotes Keim's words to the same effect: 'Bei allen Differenzen ist der Eindruck der Vereinbarkeit beider Gerichte geweiss vorherrschend' (p. 246). Lipsius, too, argues for the identity of Gal. ii. 1–10 and Acts xv., and admits that the author of the Acts has preserved an historical reminiscence. (See his remarks in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*, zweite Abtheilung, pp. 22, 23, 1891.) On the essential agreement between Paul and the Twelve, see above chap. i. p. 14, and the important remarks of Ritschl, Weizsäcker, and others, as against the standpoint of Baur and Schwegler. To the testimonies there given we may now add the emphatic statement of Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 60, 61 (comp. H. Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 209): that any essential distinction between the preaching of Paul and the primitive Apostles as to the teaching, life, sufferings and resurrection of Jesus is inconceivable in itself, and no trace of it can be found either in the New Testament or the literature of the sub-Apostolic age; these facts constituted a province raised above all dispute (1 Cor. xv. 11, Phil. i. 18).

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 104 ff.; cf. Lindemann, *ubi supra* (as against Steck), pp. 9, 10, 42–46.

ter of Paul, as he is represented in the Epistle, equally so: and the whole section Gal. ii. 1–7 is rejected as a monstrosity and an interpolation.[1] In Galatians Paul is represented as treating with the original Apostles on an equal footing; he makes no concessions; he comes, he sees, he conquers—this Paul of the Galatians, in spite of the heroic part which he is supposed to play, is an ideal figure drawn by a later hand; the whole account is crowded with improbabilities and contradictions;[2] we possess in it only the Pauline legend, which, if taken historically, is seen to be the most improbable version of the circumstances which could be conceived. Nor can it be doubted, in Steck's judgment, that in a still greater measure dogmatic influences were at work. If the book of the Acts is the representation of a mediating member of the Pauline school, we hear in the Epistle to the Galatians the answer of a radical disciple of Paul. The Apostle of the Gentiles, says the author of the Acts, is no enemy of the law and of the Jewish Christians; he has had most friendly intercourse with the Church of Jerusalem and with the original Apostles from the first; he has celebrated the festivals of his nation; he has even approved circumcision in a special case; he has transacted everything in peace and friendship, and only aroused the general hostility, not of Jewish Christians, but of stubborn Jews. What! cries the author of the Galatians, must our Paul have so spoken and acted? Never! He has not received his gospel from men, but directly from Jesus Christ: he has never made the least concession, but to the false and intruding brethren he has not yielded even for an hour; he has maintained his own standpoint in opposition to the chief of the Apostles, Peter, and corrected him when in a weak and cowardly moment he had yielded to the Judaisers.[3] But why, we may well ask, is the yielding Paul of the Acts, in Steck's description, of necessity an historical character? Let him believe it who will, says Lindemann, that the Paul who once exceeded all in zeal was now suddenly powerless. Even if it was true, he adds, that the narrative

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 103; see also B. Bauer, *Kritik der paulin. Briefe*, p. 21.
[2] Steck, *ibid.* p. 107. [3] Steck, *ibid.* pp. 119 ff.

of the Acts deprives the Apostle of all other signs of an inflexible character, there still remains the bold demeanour described in xv. 39, which testifies to his unyielding nature, and which is in reality the same trait which is revealed to us in the dispute at Antioch as the scene is painted in the Galatian Epistle.[1]

But we are constrained to ask: from whence did Steck derive his picture of the character of Paul, 'the beautiful and human Paul of the Acts'? and how can he speak of him as a great historical reality, apart from the question of the genuineness of his Epistles, unless he is prepared to recognise to a very great extent the truthfulness of the traditionary account of early Christianity, and, as we have already seen, the historicity of the Acts? Can we wonder that such a procedure should be regarded as far too conservative, and that a critic like van Manen should condemn Steck's 'conservatism,' whilst he not only agrees with him in rejecting the *Hauptbriefe*, but goes further still, and confesses that in his view Paul has ceased to be a plainly discernible historical reality; that Steck has no ground whatever for his description of Paul as the originator of the whole movement within which the Pauline *Hauptbriefe* stood, and that it remains a puzzle for him how one passes from the 'Pauline' Paul to the Paulinism of these Epistles?[2]

But is it not obvious (as Gloël has so well shown) that many of the historical difficulties which Steck has raised,

[1] Lindemann, *ubi supra*, p. 42. On the representation of Peter's conduct in Gal. ii., and its consistency with what we know of him elsewhere, see Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 201, 3. Aufl., and the important remarks of Dr. Sanday *in loco* (Ellicott's *N. T. Commentary*, ii. 436): 'The true explanation of the incident is to be found in the character of Peter—at once generously impulsive and timidly sensitive to the opinion of others. An inconsistency very similar to this appears in his ardent confession followed by the betrayal of his Master (Mark xiv. 29, 66 *et seq.*). It had been seen at an earlier date in his attempt to walk upon the water (Matt. xiv. 28–33); and is, indeed, one of the features in his character most conspicuous in the Gospels. *A little more attention to this would have saved many doctrinaire objections to the narrative of the Acts*, where the inconsistency, which is really one of character, is treated as if it stood in the way of the objective truth of the events.'

[2] Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, 1890, pp. 16–18; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie*, pp. 358, 359, 1890.

quite apart from those which are concerned with the characters of Peter and Paul, would have been solved had he only given due allowance to the simple fact that the Epistle to the Galatians is an Epistle and not a history? His contention is that the author of the Galatians purposed to correct in every detail the account of the Acts as to Paul's life and work. But the historical information is evidently subservient to a definite didactic aim. The author is concerned to show by a reference to historical facts, that Paul's gospel was the result of a direct revelation from God; that the heads of the Church at Jerusalem had added nothing to it, and that Paul had advocated his gospel even in face of the error of Peter. But if it was the author's purpose to furnish this apologetic proof, then we have no right to expect that the historical facts which are concerned with the question shall be related with entire fulness of view. And so when Steck says of the negotiation related in Gal. ii. that it was the most senseless (p. 106) which could have been transacted, he leaves the fact entirely out of consideration, that it did not concern the Epistle to give information of the whole transaction which had been conducted in Jerusalem. The Galatian Epistle by no means excludes these transactions, of which the Acts gives us an historical report; but there was no occasion to represent them fully, any more than there was to communicate the Apostolic decree. The only question at issue was to show that the gospel preached by Paul had also found unreserved recognition in Jerusalem.[1]

Upon some of the other historical difficulties raised by Steck it is scarcely necessary to dwell at length. When, *e.g.*,

In the following pages constant reference will be made to the treatise of Gloël, and many of his arguments have been rendered into the text. Dr. Sanday, it will be remembered, has described this work of Gloël's as perhaps the most decisive reply to Steck's attack upon the *Hauptbriefe*. Gloël's early death in the June of last year called forth an appreciative notice of his life and labours in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* (July 24), pp. 723–6. (Dr. Salmon also refers to Gloël's treatise, *Introd.* p. 356, 5th edit. See, too, Nösgen in his *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 20, 1891.)

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 51, 52; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 6.

he insists that the Galatians is at variance with the Acts with reference to Paul's conversion and the circumstances attendant upon it, it is plain that in each the conversion is regarded as an act of God, and that Paul's commission to preach his gospel is in each derived from a divine and not a human source (cf. Gal. i. 15, 16 with Acts xxii. 21, and Gal. ii. 7, 8).[1] The part assigned to Ananias in the Acts, which Steck seems willing to admit as probably historical,[2] does not exclude the Apostle's statement in Gal. i. 12, that he had not received his Gospel from men ;[3] the journey to Arabia is also not excluded by the narrative of the Acts, nor does it follow from the Galatians that Paul avoided all intercourse with the Christians at Damascus, and disdained all human sources of information.[4] The fact that the Apostle remained so long absent from Jerusalem after his conversion may be easily explained, if we bear in mind that as he was converted by the exalted Christ, so for him the Messiahship of Jesus depended not upon what He was or had done and taught in His earthly life, nor upon the information which could be obtained from the primitive Apostles, but upon what Jesus had become through His death and resurrection ;[5] or if we remember that it is almost impossible to suppose that

[1] Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, p. 39. 'Ganz übereinstimmend mit Act. ist dem Paulus sein Evangelium an die Heiden ausdrücklick nicht durch menschlichen, sondern göttlichen Auftrag überbunden worden, Act. xxii. 17. Wer sollte überhaupt Paulus über Heidenmission instruirt oder ein Colleg gelesen habe (Gal. i. 12), da er doch der erste war, der dieses Werk mit Erfolg betrieb ? Vgl. Gal. ii. 7 u. 8, wo das " mir vertraut " ein Gott gegeben Meisterschaft und Bewährung andeutet.'

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 92.

[3] Cf. Lindemann, *ubi supra.*

[4] See especially Lindemann's answer to Steck's objections on each of these points, *ubi supra*, p. 40.

Compare also Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 89, and Conybeare and Howson, *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 82.

[5] This is the answer of B. Weiss to Steck's objections : 'Die Bedenken, die neuerdings R. Steck (*Der Galaterbrief*, Berlin, 1888) gegen dies Fernbleiben erhoben hat, erledigen sich einfach dadurch, dass dem Apostel in Folge seiner Bekehrung durch den erhöhten Christus die messianische Bedeutung Jesu eben nicht in dem lag, was derselbe in seinem irdischen Leben gewesen war oder gethan und belehrt hatte, und was er darum von den Uraposteln erkunden konnte, sondern in dem, was er durch seinen Tod und seine Auferstehung geworden war' (*Einleitung*, p. 117, 2. Aufl.).

Paul, before his short visit to Peter in Jerusalem, was ignorant of all the circumstances of the earthly life of Jesus.[1] But no one can mistake the bias of a writer who lays stress upon definite notes of time, as evidence of accurate information, in the narrative of the Acts, and dismisses them as altogether untrustworthy in his estimate of the Epistle to the Galatians ;[2] who sees in the former book the representation of some mediating follower of the Apostle, and in the latter 'the Pauline legend' at work, full of improbabilities and inconsistencies, having for its object the exaltation of Paul, as the hero of freedom, who owed nothing to Peter or James.[3] An impartial reader will rather find in these definite notes of

[1] See further on this point, chap. viii.

Lindemann points out that Paul, as a persecutor of the Christians, must have made acquaintance with their teaching ; or, as he asks, are we to suppose that men persecute that of which they know nothing? According to Acts vi. Paul had contended with one of the ablest Christian teachers, as a member of the Cilician synagogue ; while Steck proceeds throughout upon the one-sided presupposition that Paul's mind at the time of his conversion must have been a *tabula rasa*. Lindemann, it is to be noticed, insists no less than a conservative writer like Dr. Gloël that the Apostle's 'Gospel' was based upon the deepest religious experiences of a life, and was not merely the result of instruction from without, or of a gradual mental process, although he sees no difficulty in supposing that intercourse with his fellow-Christians aided the inward illumination of the Apostle.

See especially Lindemann, *ubi supra*, pp. 9, 40, and comp. Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 48–51. Lindemann remarks (p. 40) : 'Paulus hat sich jedenfalls von den Christen nicht abgesondert, davon ist im Gal. gar keine Rede ; aber als tief religiöse Natur kann er doch über seinen früheren Wandel nicht so leicht hinweggehen wie Leute der Gegenwart, die ungenirt von einem Lager und extrem ins andere übergehen und sich in ihrem Leben öfters häuten.'

[2] Steck puts down the 'fourteen years' mentioned in Gal. ii. 1 as a mere artificial number, in which the author of the Epistle expresses his protest against the way in which the Acts represents Paul as in continuous intercourse with Jerusalem (Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 111) ; but, as Glöel asks, where is there any proof of such protest in Gal. ii. 1 ? and why is the precise number fourteen chosen ? are we to suppose that the reason lies in the fact that fourteen is exactly double the symbolic number seven ? and is a secret symbolism also to be found in the number of years mentioned in Gal. i. 18 ? Is it at all probable that any writer of the second century, such as Steck supposes, would have dared to introduce such fictitious notes of time in opposition to prevailing tradition ? (Glöel, *ubi supra*, p. 52). So, too, Lipsius, as against Steck's contention that fourteen is an 'artificial number' (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 18).

[3] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 119, 120.

time the proof of a truthful recollection, and in the decisive and pointed communications of the Epistle the clear echo of the personal reminiscences of the author.[1]

But the Galatians is subjected to criticism not only on the ground of its supposed incompatibility with historical circumstances; its language, according to Steck, proves that so far from being the oldest of the *Hauptbriefe*, as it has generally been regarded, it is in reality the youngest, and the order ought to be Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians.

No doubt there are many points of contrast between Romans and Galatians; but there is nothing strange in this circumstance, and it at once becomes intelligible if in the two Epistles the same author is handling kindred questions.[2] If, *e.g.*, as Gloël points out, we find in the so-called 'dogmatic' chief section of the Galatians (iii. 1–iv. 7) a shorter representation of the teaching of salvation than that which is more fully drawn out in the Romans, we are not, as Steck maintains,[3] reduced to the dilemma that either the shorter passage is the outline and the longer the completion, or that the shorter is an abstract of the longer; there remains the further possibility that the same man is drawing on each occasion from the riches of his mental store without of necessity referring in the one case to his exposition in the other. Only upon one supposition would these points of contact appear strange, viz. if we had in one Epistle mechanical repetitions of the expressions and turns contained in the other. This is not the case, and there is no single passage, says Gloël, in the Galatians which exactly corresponds with a passage in the Romans, unless it be a quotation from the Old Testament which is employed in each Epistle; there is no single detailed expression in the Galatians of such a kind that we are *compelled* to view it as borrowed from the Romans.[4] And this decisive refusal to

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 52.

[2] 'Ich erinnere nur an die unzähligen gegenseitigen Berührungen und Wiederholungen die sich in Luther's Schriften finden' (Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 29).

[3] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 51; cf. Lindemann, *ubi supra*, pp. 34–8.

[4] 'Nirgend begegnet uns im Galaterbrief ein Satz, der vollständig einem Satze des Römerbriefes gleich wäre, es sei denn ein in beiden Briefen verwendetes alttestamentliches Citat. Nirgend ist der Ausdruck im Einzelnen so geartet, dass

regard the Galatians as dependent upon the Romans is by no means confined to conservative critics; it is equally emphasised, as Gloël well reminds us, by Lindemann,[1] and especially by Karl Holsten, who, after a thorough analysis of the Galatian Epistle, shows that the view of its literary dependence upon the Romans is entirely excluded, and that just as little can a fundamental difference be affirmed in the attitude of the two Epistles towards the law and Judaism. A comparison of their contents must convince us that the same powerful mind is at work in both Epistles, and whatever differences exist between them are explained by the fact that the same author is writing under changed conditions.[2]

If we examine, under Gloël's guidance, some of the passages to which Steck appeals in support of his theory, his method of procedure is seen to be sufficiently arbitrary. Some of the figures and examples used in the Galatians must have been familiar enough to all readers of the Old Testament, and would naturally be introduced for illustration without our being compelled to adopt the view that they were borrowed from the previously written Epistle to the Romans.[3] And if, again, the writer of the Galatians quickly passes from one figure to another—as, *e.g.*, in Steck's view of Gal. iv. 1–7, where the figure of the heir and his tutors (verses 1 and 2) is exchanged for one borrowed from a state of slavery and not of sonship (verse 5)—such a transition by no means demands a literary dependence upon Rom. viii. 14–17, as Steck maintains ('Der Galaterbrief,' p. 64), but is quite in harmony with the style of the other Pauline Epistles, where the writer introduces one figure after another, or does not

er zu der Annahme einer Entstehung aus dem Römerbrief zwänge' (Glöel, *ubi supra*, p. 30).

[1] Lindemann, *ubi supra*, pp. 5–8 and 34–8, 41, 55.

[2] 'Kritische Briefe über die neueste paulinische Hypothese,' von Karl Holsten, in der *Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1889, Nr. 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 26; referred to by Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 13.

[3] What, *e.g.*, could be more natural than the appeal to the faith of Abraham in Gal. iii. 5 and 6, when the Apostle is addressing those who boasted themselves upon their descent from Abraham, and depended upon that for salvation? Cf. Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 31, 33, 34, and Lindemann, p. 36.

trouble himself to work out his comparison in all its details.[1]

Nor is it easy to see how a writer, unless he had a theory to serve, could seriously maintain that Gal. iii. 13 is to be explained by referring to Rom. iii. 25. Even if the assertion that 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us' (Gal. iii. 13), contains another form of the thought 'whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness' (Rom. iii. 25), there is surely no valid reason to allege that we have here an instance of borrowing.[2]

Nor, again, are we called upon to believe that the phrase 'to put on Christ' (Gal. iii. 27) is a combination of Rom. vi. 3 and xiii. 14; not only is the expression differently applied in the Galatian Epistle, but the connection of the verses 26–28 is so close and natural, that it is quite arbitrary to suppose the introduction of thoughts borrowed from elsewhere.[3]

And even if, as Steck maintains, there are expressions in Galatians upon which considerable light is thrown by passages in Romans, it is just this mutual supplementary relationship of the two Epistles which speaks, as Gloël argues, for the identity of authorship, while it excludes a literary dependence consisting in a mere mechanical transference of words and phrases from one Epistle to another.[4]

But if we turn to the passage before which, in Steck's opinion, all doubt vanishes, and the dependence of Galatians upon Romans is decisively proved, it would seem, says Gloël, that the clearness of thought which Steck promises as a result of his theory is only rendered hopelessly obscure. According to him, Gal. v. 13–18 can only be explained by reminiscences of Rom. vii., and he supposes that the latter chapter is known to the readers of the Galatian Epistle. No doubt the struggle represented in Gal. v. reminds us of Rom. vii.; here, as there,

[1] Cf. *e.g.* 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3, with *vv.* 12–18 of the same chapter; or, again, the figure in Rom. vii. 2, &c. Gloël, p. 33.

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 57, 58. [3] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 33.

[4] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 57–60. Compare Gloël, p. 32.

we are concerned with the struggle against the flesh and its sinful lust. But, as Gloël shows, it is quite a different struggle against the flesh which is spoken of in the two passages. In Rom. vii. the author is speaking of the unavailing struggle which the law, with the consent of the inner man, carries on against sin in the flesh. In Gal. v. the Divine Spirit is represented as an adversary to the flesh which is superior to it. Steck acknowledges that in Gal. v. 16 the Spirit signifies the spirit of the new life; but he thinks that in the next verse (verse 17), it signifies 'the inward man' spoken of in Rom. vii. No doubt such an interpretation would strengthen the view that the section of Galatians in question is an abridgment of the fuller teaching of the Romans; but is there any ground for adopting it? Is it not rather evident that immediately we connect 'the Spirit' in verse 17 with the same word in verse 16, and understand it of the spirit of the new life—*i.e.* the Spirit of God—without any reference to Rom. vii. (where, as Steck himself admits, the word 'spirit' is not used [1]), we have a continuous sequence of thought which is only confused by the introduction into the text of expressions taken from a passage of a totally different meaning? The whole section, verses 16–18, stands in close connection, says Gloël, with the verses which precede and follow, and there is no occasion to maintain with Steck that verse 18 is a reminiscence of Rom. vi. 14, viii. 14, and is quite inconsistent with the context in which we here find it.[2]

Such a mode of expression could not be altogether foreign to a writer who had already discussed at length the position of the Galatians with reference to the law (Gal. iii. 1–iv. 7); but Gloël shows us that it has in verse 18 its own fitting significance. In opposition to the Judaisers, the Apostle declares that the victory over the desires of the flesh can be obtained by a higher might than the law. The office of the law was to oppose the lust of the flesh, and he who lived after the flesh stood in need of the discipline of the law. But he who lived after the Spirit subdued the lust of the flesh by a divine power, and stood no longer under the law. To him

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 72. [2] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 73.

the law with its prohibition has nothing to say (cf. also Gal. v. 23); in the power of the Spirit, and with inward freedom, he lives in the practice of the love which the law demands, and therefore he no longer needs the external compulsion of the law (cf. v. 22 with v. 13–15).[1]

But if Steck's theory fails of proof when tested by particular passages, does it gain any support from the alleged difference in the general point of view of the two Epistles? This difference, in Steck's judgment, is shown by the comparative depreciation of the law in Galatians, and by the manner in which Jew and Gentile are placed on an equal footing in the face of Christianity, so widely removed from the value attached to Judaism in Romans (especially ix. 1–5); it is therefore impossible to suppose that Galatians preceded Romans, when we see how much further it is removed from the Jewish point of view; it occupies rather a middle place between the Paulinism of the Roman Epistle and the Paulinism of Marcion.[2] But the differences upon which Steck insists are capable, as Gloël proceeds to show, of a perfectly fair explanation. No doubt the opposition to the Judaisers in Galatians is more acute than in the Romans, and, as a natural result, the transitory significance of the law is more pointedly emphasised.

The Galatians were far more likely to become a prey to Judaism than the readers of the Roman Epistle, and it was therefore necessary to draw the line of demarcation between their state under the law and their state under grace with the utmost clearness. But the position assigned to the law is not materially changed. In Galatians, as well as in Romans, divine authority attaches to the Scriptures, of which the law is a constitutive part (iii. 8, 10, 13, iv. 27, 30), and not only so but the law itself is represented as a means of acquiring a

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 36. 'So zeigt es sich, dass in V. 16–18 ein geschlossener Gedankengang herrscht, sobald man nur diesen Abschnitt *für sich selbst* und in seinem Zusammenhang mit den vorangehenden und nachfolgenden Ausführungen unseres Briefes betrachtet. Sobald man aber die andersgearteten Aussagen aus Röm. vii. in unseren Text hineinträgt, bringt man ihn in heillose Verwirrung. Sollte das nicht ein deutlicher Beweis dafür sein, dass man sich der von Steck geübten "Erklärung" aus dem Römerbriefe zu entschlagen hat?' (Gloël, p. 37).

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 75–7.

knowledge of the demands of the divine will (v. 14, cf. iv. 21). Certainly the law is spoken of as ordained by angels in distinction to the promise given directly by God (iii. 19). But such a conception is diametrically opposed to that of Marcion, according to whom the law is not to be attributed to the good God at all; and yet, in Steck's judgment, the Galatians is only a step removed from the position of Marcion![1] But to take this step, says Gloël, one must break entirely with the value attached in Galatians to the Old Testament, and with the belief which breathes throughout the Epistle, not only of the essential unity of all divine revelation, but also of the unity of the God thus revealing Himself: the connection between the salvation offered in Christ and the old covenant, which is so expressly emphasised by Paul in this Epistle, must be destroyed, in order to arrive at the conception of the law entertained by Marcion. The Galatian Epistle, therefore, cannot, he adds, be regarded as a means of transition from the Paulinism of Romans to that of Marcion, since it stands upon the same ground as the former, while Marcion occupies an entirely different position. The same result follows if we take account of the relation between heathenism and Judaism. Certainly in Romans the origin of the former is traced back to a falling-away from the God who had manifested Himself to man, while the favoured position of Israel is emphasised (cf. Rom. i. 18 with ix. 1–5, iv. 1): in Galatians both heathenism and Judaism are equally regarded as states of immaturity and childhood. It might therefore appear as if in the two Epistles the points of view from which Gentile and Jew are regarded are quite distinct. But in Galatians, where Judaism and heathenism are comprehensively viewed together, there is also a marked contrast between the two—'we who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles' (ii. 15); and so it is plain that Gal. iv. does not entirely cancel the distinction. The true account of the matter, in Gloël's judgment, is that from one point of view the two pre-Christian forms of religion might be placed under the same category, whilst from another they might be con-

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 75, 'nur noch ein Schritt.'

trasted. If we regard them from the point of view of the salvation revealed in Christ, both heathenism and Judaism are insufficient and inferior, but yet, in the preparation for that salvation, Judaism differed widely from heathenism. But why, he asks, should it appear strange that the man who could write the Epistle to the Romans should be able to treat of Judaism from two different points of view? Might we not rather expect that such a rich and powerful mind would throw fresh light from time to time upon the same subjects, and that the Apostle would endeavour to gain by new paths a fuller and wider recognition of the message of the one salvation which possessed him heart and soul?[1]

The relation of 1 Corinthians to Romans, and the priority of the latter, is supported by similar arguments. Thus, *e.g.*, the key to the meaning of 1 Cor. xv. 56 is to be found in Rom. vii. 8–13, because it is there made clear that death is the result of sin:[2] Rom. vii. 1–2 precedes 1 Cor. vii. 39, because the ex-

[1] For a full criticism of Steck's position see Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 5, 6, 41–5. Gloël pertinently asks those who refuse to regard the Pauline Epistles under discussion as composed by the same author, whether they are prepared to deny that the first and second part of *Faust* are the work of the same poet. If not, they have no right to dispute the possibility of an identity of authorship in the case of the *Hauptbriefe*: 'Ich bin vielmehr überzeugt, dass diese Briefe ihrem gesamten Inhalt nach einander viel näher stehen, als dies hinsichtlich jener beiden Seite der Goethe'schen Faustdichtung der Fall ist' (p. 44).

In the same way, as Gloël reminds us, it would follow that we must refuse to recognise accredited sayings and writings of Luther's if we applied to them the standards of criticism which Steck applies to St. Paul. We are not surprised if we find in Luther expressions which are often almost exact repetitions of what he has said before; and we are also not surprised if he uses expressions at brief intervals which appear to differ widely from each other; if, *e.g.*, he complains to-day of the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist, the destroyer of souls, and if to-morrow he addresses himself in prayer to the 'Holy Father' to lay to his hand and to put a bridle upon the hypocritical enemies of peace; if to-day he composes a polemic in which the struggle is carried to the bitterest extreme, and if to-morrow, in the midst of the fiercest contest, he bears witness to the glorious freedom and blessed peace of a Christian man, without sounding a note of strife. Cf. Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 44, 45.

[2] 'Die Stelle 1 Cor. xv. 56 scheint Steck nicht verstehen zu können. Diese schöne Stelle wird durch Beiziehung des Gedankens, der Tod sei Folge der Sünde, unverständlich. Des Todes Dolch, oder schmerzbereitendes Werkzeug, ist die Sünde; die Wucht, die den Dolch führende Muskelkraft ist das Gesetz. Die Kenntniss des Gesetzes vermehrt den Ernst und die Bitterkeit des Todes. Dies Bild hat mit dem Gedanken der Tod sei Folge der Sünde nichts zu tun' (Lindemann, *ubi supra*, p. 49).

pression 'so long as he lives' occurs in both places, and the imagery is worked out more fully in Romans; Rom. xv. 2–3 appears to be a fuller expression of the shorter exhortation in 1 Cor. xi. 1: 'Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ'; further parallels may be found in 1 Cor. x. 11 and Rom. xv. 4: 1 Cor. xiv. 33 and Rom. xv. 33, 'the God of peace:' 1 Cor. xvi. 1 and Rom. xv. 26, where the mention of 'the saints' in the first-named passage is explained by 'the saints who are at Jerusalem' in the second: Rom. xii. 4–8 reads like an epitome of 1 Cor. xii. 4–11, but we are not called upon to suppose that this is the case, although Steck had previously laid it down as a fundamental axiom that in a comparison of two passages the shorter and epitomised form is derived from the more lengthy and detailed; so, too, with the familiar imagery of the body and its members; although in Romans it is summarised, there is no occasion to suppose that the much more expanded form in 1 Corinthians precedes it.[1]

But Steck can only refer to these instances as probabilities, and even in the cases which he quotes of verbal agreement between the two Epistles, he is obliged to allow that a definite decision as to priority is by no means easy. Thus, he institutes a comparison between the passages in 1 Cor. viii. and Rom. xiv. concerning the weak in faith (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 8, 11, 13 with Rom. xiv. 13, 15, 21), and he asks which passage precedes the other, admitting that there is much to be said on either side. But the scale is turned in favour of Rom. xiv. because whilst 'the weak in faith' is mentioned in the first verse of that chapter, in 1 Cor. viii. 'the weak' is mentioned somewhat abruptly in verse 9, although, as Steck himself points out, a 'weak conscience' had been spoken of in verse 7.[2]

In the midst of this uncertainty he confesses that he would welcome a point of connection between the two Epistles which would clinch his argument, such as he claims to have discovered in Gal. v. 21 and 1 Cor. vi. 9. And this he believes that he has found in 1 Cor. iv. 6 and Rom. xii. 3.

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 156; cf. Lindemann, pp. 13, 14, 50.
[2] Steck, p. 157.

In the former place we read, 'And these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes; that ye might learn in us not to think of men *above that which is written*, that no one of you be puffed up for one against another.' But in this warning, according to Steck, the writer can only be referring to Rom. xii. 3, 'For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think.'[1] Whilst, however, we may agree with Steck in refusing to admit any allusion to Christ's exhortations to humility, and may recognise the difficulty of supposing that any of His sayings could be quoted at such an early date in a written form, it is not so easy to see why Steck should put out of court the explanation adopted by Meyer and other commentators, viz. that the author of 1 Corinthians is referring in general terms to passages in the Old Testament, especially as Steck himself allows that as a rule a reference to the Old Testament Scriptures is introduced by a very similar, if not by the very same, formula.[2]

But Steck has to maintain his theory of the relative priority of the four great Pauline Epistles, and he arbitrarily rejects all that cannot be made to harmonise with it. A proof of this may be seen in his usual way of interpreting the expressions 'as I have written,' 'it is written,' and so forth. In this same 1 Corinthians he reads (v. 9), 'I have written to you in a letter not to company with fornicators,' and he describes this as a similar passage to the one which he has just discussed (iv. 6). He is obliged to admit that he does not know to what letter the writer alludes, but he finds no difficulty in rejecting what he allows is the general explanation, viz. that reference is made to an earlier and lost Epistle to the Corinthians, because such an expedient appeals to the unknown, and has the least probability according to his special view of the origin of the four *Hauptbriefe*.[3]

But it is from a comparison of the two passages (to which Steck refers in his attempt to establish the priority of Romans to 1 Corinthians) Gal. v. 19–21 and 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, that

[1] Steck, p. 158. [2] Steck, pp. 158–60. [3] Steck, pp. 160, 161.

'the great light' is thrown upon the order of the sequence of the Pauline Epistles. In Gal. v. 19, 20, the works of the flesh are named, and in verse 21 it is said with reference to these: 'of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*.' But in 1 Cor. vi. 9, we read: 'Know ye not that the unrighteous *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*?' and after an enumeration of the various kinds of unrighteousness, the same judgment follows, viz. that *they shall not inherit the kingdom of God*. Steck lays special stress upon the verbal agreement in the expression, *βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν*.[1] But, as Gloël well asks, is anything so remarkable expressed in this sentence that we can only be allowed to meet with it once in the same author? The expression *κληρονομεῖν βασιλείαν θεοῦ* was probably a form of speech quite as familiar as *κληρονομεῖν ζωὴν αἰώνιον* (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50, Matt. xix. 29; Matt. xxv. 34; Mark x. 17; Luke x. 25, xviii. 18), and it already had its roots in the language of the Old Testament. But if we are to insist upon verbal agreements in the two passages, we must not overlook the verbal differences; and it is not only to be noted that whilst in 1 Corinthians the different kinds of *evil-doers* are enumerated, in Galatians we have a list of the different kinds of *vice* (*πόρνοι, εἰδωλολάτραι κ.τ.λ.* in 1 Corinthians, but *πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία κ.τ.λ.* in Galatians), but it is further observable that whilst in 1 Corinthians we have ten kinds of evil-doers, in Galatians we have fifteen forms of vice, and that in the two lists of enormities only three exactly correspond with one another; *πόρνοι, εἰδωλολάτραι, μέθυσοι* in 1 Corinthians, and *πορνεία, εἰδωλολατρία, μέθαι* in Galatians. But, as Gloël reminds us, it is just these three—fornication, idolatry, drunkenness—which as a matter of fact had to be specially combated in the early Christian Churches gathered out of the surrounding heathen world; and there is surely nothing remarkable in the circumstance that the same man in writing to Galatian and Corinthian converts should warn them that the immoralities practised among the Gentiles would exclude bap-

[1] Steck, p. 153.

tised Christians from any inheritance in the kingdom of God. But there is another expression used in Gal. v. 21, which, if rightly understood, is sufficient proof for Steck that the Galatian Epistle presupposes 1 Corinthians—*ὡς προεῖπον* must refer to the words previously used in 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. When, however, we recall the fact that Paul had twice exercised his missionary activity amongst the Galatians, and that the whole Galatian Epistle presupposes a personal acquaintance between the writer and his readers, what was more natural than that he should remind them of his earlier oral teaching in the word *προεῖπον*? and what more natural than that he should repeat to the fickle Galatians a warning obviously needed in such a community? Steck condemns this view as a mere conjecture and an empty pretext; but if his own theory is correct, then, as Zahn puts it, the canon of criticism must in future run thus: the writer of an Epistle can only appeal to written, not to oral, expressions which he had previously used, and in Epistles 'to say' means 'to write.'[1]

But it is in his treatment of 2 Corinthians that Steck's theory makes the most extraordinary demands upon him. His object, we must remind ourselves, is to show that the right order of the *Hauptbriefe* is, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians. He readily admits that 1 Corinthians precedes 2 Corinthians, but how can he show that the latter Epistle is really the third in the order which he supposes? In 2 Corinthians Paul speaks of his ensuing visit to the Corinthian Church as a third coming to Corinth (2 Cor. xii. 14, 20, xiii. 1). No doubt in their form of expression these announcements relate to proposed journeys of the Apostle, and to his personal coming—all this Steck is bound to admit, but, he adds, as a matter of fact they relate rather to his spiritual coming, *i.e.* through letters. It is treated as of no consequence (as Zahn points out), that Paul had spoken quite unequivocally in the same connection of 'the third coming' as of a future fact, and that he opposes this act of writing in his absence to his proposed personal visit (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 2, 10). But after the announcement of his third coming, the

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 37–40; Zahn, p. 463; Steck, p. 153.

writer adds *ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν σταθήσεται πᾶν ῥῆμα* (2 Cor. xiii. 1): here is a great support for Steck's theory, and in this veiled manner we have an intimation that our 2 Corinthians is the third in the order of the Pauline writings, and the three witnesses would therefore be the three Epistles, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians. It is surely no wonder that Lindemann can say 'Such arbitrariness needs no refutation'[1] (p. 50), and that even Steck himself seems doubtful as to the validity of his own arguments (cf. pp. 160, 161).

It is thus that Steck seeks to explain what he names the correct order of the four Epistles, and he contends that a gradual advance in vehemence of tone and in opposition to the Judaic section of the Church characterises the sequence. In Romans there is a calm and measured style, only marked here and there by polemical outbursts. In 1 and 2 Corinthians the Paulinism becomes more and more decided in tone, and increases in its vehemence as the close of the second Epistle is reached. But the most vehement of all is the Galatians, in which the entire independence of the Apostle is represented, and the severance of a liberal and cultured Gentile-Christianity from a legal and slavish Judaism.[2]

No doubt some of the expressions upon which Steck (as Pierson and Naber before him) relies are not free from obscurity, and it is easy to magnify the different views of the date and place of the composition of the Galatian Epistle, and of the localities occupied by its readers, into serious difficulties and objections; but may it not, asks Zahn, be fairly maintained that whatever obscurities exist can be made to tell rather for than against the Epistle? Steck, *e.g.*, argues that, when Paul writes (Gal. iv. 13), *οἴδατε δὲ ὅτι δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν τὸ πρότερον*, we have here a kind of elliptical mode of expression which none could understand except the Galatians themselves; only they could know whether the matter really thus stood and could so easily be remembered by them.[3] But is not this exactly what we might expect? The mere fact, as Zahn argues, that the

[1] 'Solche Willkür bedarf keine Widerlegung.'

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 162. [3] Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 47.

writer appeals so frequently to the acquaintance of his readers with the circumstances in question, and that we can only laboriously and imperfectly grasp the varied relations which everywhere prevail throughout the Pauline Epistles, is a convincing proof, not only that countless details must have been known to the readers which we, as interpreters, must be content to envy them, but that these writings had their source in real life, and took account of the actual events of life. Zahn points this argument by a comparison between the Epistles of Paul and various unauthentic letters. We have, *e.g.*, a letter of Peter to James which stands at the head of the Clementines; a letter of Paul to the Laodiceans; a correspondence between the Apostle and the Corinthians; a series of fictitious letters of Ignatius, and many others. But here, says Zahn, we seek in vain for any logical or philological difficulties. The historical situations from which these documents claim to proceed are indeed very imperfectly represented, since here the imagination of the writers failed to give a lifelike reality to the picture: but there is no question of obscure allusions to relations unknown to us, and of ambiguities in this respect; all that the forger desires his readers to know he declares directly and plainly; *and he is obliged to do so, because, as a matter of fact, he has under his feet no basis of actual relations, a knowledge of which he can presuppose in his readers.*[1] In the very nature of the case, we have no right to demand that any Epistle should reveal all the historical conditions under which it was written for the benefit of the later historian. And the more we recognise the fact, upon which recent criticism so strongly insists, that the Pauline Epistles are occasional writings, writings designed to meet certain emergencies and varying questions as they arise from time to time, the more is it reasonable to conclude with Gloël that the relations of author and reader are only so far discussed as was needed for the special occasion, and as was required by the burning questions for the solution of which the particular Epistle was written. Even, therefore, if all the historical difficulties which Steck discusses at such length in

[1] Zahn, p. 464.

his opening pages actually existed, no ground would thus be afforded for the rejection of the Galatian Epistle. Every literature, Gloël adds, supplies instances of writings which are by no means free from obscure surroundings, if we seek to know every detail of their composition, but which are nevertheless ascribed without hesitation to a definite author. No one, *e.g.*, denies that 'Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott' was the work of Luther, although its exact date and the particular circumstances which called it forth are lost in obscurity.[1]

Steck himself, as Gloël points out, evidently felt at times the force of this argument, and that the apparent difficulties in the Pauline Epistles bear witness that we are dealing with actual occurrences, but he cannot resist the temptation of attempting to solve these difficulties by supposing that we have to do with sections derived from various sources. He might, Gloël continues, have listened with advantage to the advice that, in opposition to this inclination to cut the knots, the prudent historian must often be content to stand in his inquiries before unsolved and insoluble puzzles; and the theologian, in the same manner, when face to face with the New Testament, must recognise many historical difficulties which he cannot remove. The scientific task will often far rather consist in the recognition of existing difficulties than in their smooth solution.[2]

If, moreover, in the Galatian Epistle it is at times difficult to trace the connection, and the argument seems to proceed by leaps and bounds, is not this, asks Gloël, to be ex-

[1] Gloël, pp. 72–4. 'Wenn unser Kritiker wiederholt erklärt, es sei nicht ersichtlich, wo der Galaterbrief abgefasst sei und er sei, weil nicht ausführlich und nicht wohlgeordnet und nicht leichtverständlich, jedenfalls nicht original, dann müssen auch wir wiederholen, dass man einerseits unter dergleichen Behauptungen Schillers *Tell* als historische Quelle behaupten, und anderseits gewisse Schriften Kants als Ueberarbeitung einer Quellenschrift hinstellen könnte' (Lindemann, p. 41).

[2] 'Dieser Neigung, die Knoten zu durchhauen, gegenüber ist daran zu erinnern, dass der besonnene Historiker bei seinem Forschen oft vor ungelösten und unlösbaren Rätseln stehen bleiben muss, und dass der Theolog dem Neuen Testamente gegenüber ebenso vor mancher historischen Schwierigkeit stehen bleiben muss, die er nicht heben kann. Oft wird die wissenschaftliche Aufgabe viel mehr in der klaren Erkenntniss der vorhandenen Schwierigkeit als in ihrer glatten Lösung bestehen' (Gloël, p. 73).

pected in an Epistle which, as Steck admits, is a sharp polemic, and in which we come face to face with a vigorous and inflexible man? Would not such a writing be likely to have its edges and corners? Would not the thoughts press tumultuously upon each other?[1]

Closely united with this polemical sharpness we find a personal colouring and a directness and freshness which, until recently, all critics, as Gloël well reminds us, have regarded as a proof of inimitable originality. Steck cannot altogether rid himself of the impression which these characteristics of the letter make upon every impartial critic, and he tries to rid himself of it partly by maintaining that this life and freshness can be feigned, as in the case of the Pastoral Epistles, where a reference to Paul's mantle is introduced as a mark of genuineness, just as the biographical notice in the Galatians, forgetful that even such critics as Pfleiderer and Hausrath have been compelled to acknowledge considerable sections of 2 Tim., especially that containing the mention of the cloak and the parchments; partly by falling back upon the supposition of an interpolation by the later author, when such a passage as iv. 12–20 seems to reproduce in its tone an actual dialogue between the Apostle and the faithless Galatians.[2] But, as Gloël again reminds us, throughout the Epistle we are not listening to some ideal figure, withdrawn

[1] Gloël, p. 26. Gloël points out the contradiction in which Steck is involved when at one time he describes the author of Galatians as clumsily endeavouring to fit into his Epistle stones broken out of the wall for which they were originally hewn, and at another as a striking intellectual personality and a Pauline of independent individuality (comp. Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 147, 150), Gloël, pp. 26, 27. We may compare with Gloël's remarks Lindemann, p. 41. 'Ist der Galaterbrief ein mit ruhiger Ueberlegung nach einem ausführlichen Schriftstück construirtes Werk des ausgeprägtesten Paulinismus, warum ist er dann so schwer zu verstehen, so lückenhaft geschrieben, und warum entbehrt er so sehr des logischen Zusammenhanges? Das wäre allerdings eine schwer zu begreifende Sonderbarkeit.'

[2] Gloël, pp. 91 and 93, and Steck, pp. 126–33. Steck seems at times all but convinced of the genuineness of the passage by the loving tone so characteristic of Paul, and he is forced to find evidence of awkwardness and imitation in the fact that the writer here speaks of himself as a mother of his converts (iv. 19), whilst in 1 Cor. iv. 15 the Apostle is spoken of as a father of his spiritual children! See also Lindemann, p. 12. Steck's words on p. 133 are: 'Aber das Bild *τέκνα μου οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω* erinnert doch sehr an das analoge 1 Cor. iv. 15, *ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα*. Da ist der Apostel der Vater der

from all historical connection and human relations, but to a strong living personality of flesh and blood. We can feel something of the awe which he inspired when he throws the whole weight of his personality against his opponents, and we can sympathise with him in his distress for his erring brethren, in his anxiety as of a mother for her children; we can grasp something of the might of his faith in the Crucified when he tells us how he was arrested on his path of persecution, and called from his zeal for the law to be an Apostle of the Gospel among the heathen, and when he testifies of the life which he lives in the Christ who had died, and when, in spite of all distress and persecution, he knows no other subject of boasting but the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ (i. 13, ii. 19 &c. vi. 14 &c.)[1]

But if, as is admitted, the Epistle to the Galatians was written in the midst of hot controversy and strife, a most important question at once arises: Do the contents of the Epistle represent a struggle characteristic of the first or the second century?[2] Do they compel us to surrender the early date usually assigned to the Epistle, and to adopt the view maintained by Steck—viz. that the contest between Judaism and Paulinism reached its height, not in the first, but in the second century, and that consequently the *Hauptbriefe* are to be assigned to 120–40 A.D.? And here we must take into account the bearing of the *external* testimony which the impugners of the Epistle are so accustomed to ignore or depreciate or else to misinterpret in favour of their own judgments. Steck, *e.g.*, refers to passages in Justin Martyr and in the Ignatian Epistles which he considers are a support to his view of the gradual development of the struggle between Jew and Gentile in the Christian Church, increasing

Gemeinde, der er das geistige Leben geschenkt hat, hier soll er die Mutter sein, was etwas ungeschickt lautet und eher Nachahmung sein wird als Original.'

[1] See this admirably described by Gloël, pp. 92, 93, and compare Godet's remarks on the impossibility of regarding such Epistles as Galatians and 1 and 2 Corinthians as the impersonal products of a theological school dating from a period long after the Apostles (*L'Epître aux Romains*, p. 641, 2nd edit.)

[2] For the following arguments against Steck's position see Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 84 ff.; comp. Hilgenfeld, in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1890, p. 361, where he endorses Gloël's criticisms.

in bitterness and finding its sharpest expression in the Epistle to the Galatians. But we have to ask ourselves whether the second century is the period when we first gain historical footing for the struggle represented in this Epistle, and whether the second century really witnessed the height of the conflict as to whether the Gentile Christians were to submit to the yoke of circumcision.

Let us weigh the testimony of the writers to whom Steck refers. In his 'Dialogue with Trypho' (to borrow Gloël's description), Justin distinguishes two kinds of Jewish Christians—the one which consisted of those who held fast to a life in conformity with the Jewish law, when it was practicable so to live, but did not demand the same mode of life from Gentile Christians. With regard to this class of Jewish Christians, Justin explains that, in his view, they could be saved, and he considers them as Christian brethren ; but he mentions that there were other Gentile Christians who did not adopt his view of the matter, and who denied to these Jewish Christians all brotherly fellowship, and refused them salvation. But then Justin recognises another kind of Jewish Christians, consisting of men who would compel all Christians to observe the Mosaic law, including the observance of the Sabbath and circumcision, and who would make salvation to depend upon such observance. Justin, for his part, does not recognise those Jewish Christians who thus refused freedom to their Gentile brethren, although he does not positively deny salvation to Gentile Christians who had been impelled by these Judaisers to observe the law (cf. 'Dial. cum Tryphone,' xlvii. 1–12). It appears, therefore, continues Gloël, that in Justin's time, in the middle of the second century, there were not only Jewish Christians who held fast to the law and yet remained on friendly relations with their Gentile brethren, but that there were also Jewish Christians who made the salvation of Gentile Christians dependent upon the law and the reception of circumcision, and who had gained over some amongst the Gentiles to the same views.

But Gloël points out that there is nothing in Justin's words which signifies a violent struggle between Jewish and Gentile

Christians—a struggle such as that which is described in the letter to the Galatians, where every effort is being expended to avoid the imposing of the yoke of circumcision upon the Gentile Christians, and the consequent loss of the truth and freedom of the Gospel. As a Christian philosopher, Justin justifies Christianity in opposition to heathenism, and in opposition to Judaism; in refuting the latter, he makes mention of those unbending Jewish Christians who demanded from all every legal observance; but he does not at all direct his weapons against them specially. He delivers his personal judgment upon them, with the purpose of giving a clear exposition of Judaism, but he has no anxiety whatever as to whether this Judaising party might actually enforce circumcision as a general rule. The impression which Gloël receives from Justin's words is rather this: that the Judaisers stood apart in their narrow exclusiveness, and had already received the character of a sect, which, naturally, had not given up the propagation of its views, and sometimes drew over Gentile Christians to its ranks, but which did not by any means threaten the existence of a free and far-spreading Gentile Church. Certainly, as Gloël admits, the spirit of those preachers of circumcision which the Galatian Epistle opposed lived again in these Jewish Christians of Justin's day; but, he adds, whilst such men exercised a bewitching influence upon the unsettled Christian communities at the date of the Galatian Epistle, the existence, when Justin lived, of a Christianity comprising numerous uncircumcised Gentiles was a fact well-nigh a century old, a Christianity which was not to be made retrograde by any Jewish Christian minority 'in the twinkling of an eye.'[1] Accordingly he concludes that a comparison between the expressions used by Justin and the contents of the Epistle to the Galatians must accordingly compel us to recognise that the struggle depicted in the latter belonged in Justin's day to the distant past.

But the same result follows from an examination of the Ignatian Epistles. The Church at Philadelphia is warned: *ἐὰν δέ τις Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ἑρμηνεύῃ ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.*

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 84, 85.

ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος Χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούειν, ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ('Ad Philadelph.' vi. 1). As Gloël points out, Steck rightly concludes from this passage that at the date of these letters born Gentiles had undertaken to defend the claims of Judaism. But it is well to observe, adds Gloël, that men who would be described as uncircumcised persons, and who still continued uncircumcised, come forward on behalf of Judaism. It is evident, therefore, that the reception of circumcision cannot here be included under the term Judaism; if so, these advocates of its claims must have been necessarily circumcised themselves first of all.

The question at issue may, however, be made evident, in Gloël's view, by a passage from the Epistle to the Magnesians, in which the readers are warned not to allow themselves to be led astray by *ἑτεροδοξίαι* and *μυθεύματα παλαιά*, for 'we should acknowledge ourselves to have received no grace if a *κατὰ νόμον* *Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῆν* still applied to us' (viii. 1; cf. also x. 3).

But if we turn to ix. 1 and observe that *σαββατίζειν* is opposed to *κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῆν*, Gloël considers it evident that the author sees in the observance of the Sabbath the special need for the warning against the *κατὰ νόμον Ἰουδαϊσμὸν ζῆν*, since instead of the Sabbath, Christians ought to celebrate the Lord's Day. No doubt, as Gloël admits, attempts may have been made to force other Jewish usages upon the Churches, as indeed the word *ἑτεροδοξίαι* seems to intimate, but no mention whatever is found of the rite of circumcision. But it could not possibly, he thinks, have remained unmentioned if it had been anyhow in question. The author is evidently dealing with Churches in which uncircumcised Gentile Christians formed the majority, and in which even the representatives of Judaising views no longer ventured to demand the reception of circumcision. The struggle about its observance lay in the remote background when the Ignatian letters were written, and Gloël maintains that, instead of supplying an argument in support of Steck's hypothesis, these letters militate against it, and that their opposition gains in force if we

can accept them as genuine writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, instead of dating them with Steck after 150 A.D.[1]

But Steck's own language deprives the authorities to which he himself appeals of any decisive weight in favour of his contention. He is obliged to admit that there were parts of the Christian Church which in the first thirty years of the second century were by no means in such an unsettled state as to consider circumcision a burning question, and that whilst the Judaisers might still have formed an extreme section, the main body of the Church had found an adjustment of their differences. But if this was the case then it is clear, as Gloël argues, that the extreme opposition between the Gentile Christians and the party of the circumcision must be placed earlier, and Steck's theory of the gradual development of this opposition, and of its coming to a head in the second century, falls to the ground. And if, in the second century, the question of circumcision or no circumcision could not provoke any general and earnest excitement, then it is equally clear, says Gloël, that the Epistle to the Galatians could not have been written at that date, since it is entirely devoted to the discussion of that particular question, which it regards as vital to the interests of Christianity. Gloël points out that Steck feels the difficulty to be so great that he is actually obliged to suppose that the Galatians may have been written to meet an imaginary rather than a real danger, and that the existing struggle was represented in the colouring of the Apostolic age. But if the dangers were imaginary rather than real, then, as Gloël justly maintains, the historical premisses upon which the struggle is based are wanting. Moreover, he adds, the whole character of the Epistle witnesses against the notion that any imaginary picture was being painted: for its writer, the preaching of circumcision, or the preaching of the cross, is a question of life and death. The Epistle must therefore date, as Gloël unhesitatingly asserts, from a period marked by a real and

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 85, 86; Zahn, *ubi supra*, p. 465, specially notes the insufficiency of Steck's list of authorities, inasmuch as it makes no mention of Bishop Lightfoot's great work on the Ignatian Epistles.

decisive crisis, when Christianity separated itself from Judaism, and Churches of Gentile Christians were formed, freed from the law and circumcision. And such a period was the Apostolic age.[1]

In the earliest days of the Christian Church believers were exclusively Jewish people, just as Jesus of Nazareth had worked amongst the Jews during His earthly life. And at first these believers no doubt had little thought of any separation from their nation and from the worship enjoined by the law. But when Israel as a nation continued to reject Jesus as their Messiah, and when the divine will to embrace the whole of mankind in the work of redemption grew more plain every day, it is clear that such a revelation must have made very practical claims upon those Jews who believed in Jesus, and that the question must have pressed for an answer, as to the form in which the salvation in Christ was to be presented to the Gentiles, and as to their relation to the Mosaic law.[2] But we must bear in mind that Steck is not prepared to deny that already in the Apostolic age Christian communities had been established by Apostles of Jewish origin in the Gentile world of Syria and Asia, Macedonia and Greece. But if this was the case, can there be any reasonable doubt that in the Apostolic age the problem whether Gentile converts were to be circumcised or not must have been proposed for solution, and that in the nature of the case the decision would not have been left in abeyance?[3] What that decision was is plainly declared by the existence at the commencement of the second century of Christian Churches composed of uncircumcised Gentile Christians; but such a decision could not have been reached without a struggle, and a struggle sharp and violent like that described in the Galatian Epistle: no one who considers the tenacity with which the Jews who recognised the Messiahship of Jesus still clung to Jewish ordinances could suppose for a moment that they would allow the question of circumcision to occupy a secondary place, or that they would quietly welcome the

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 86, 87.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 88. [3] *Ibid.*

birth of a Gentile Church freed from the yoke of the Mosaic law.[1]

But if we are surprised at the manner in which Steck deals with the Ignatian Letters—rejecting them as pious forgeries, and yet using them in so far as they seem to support his theory of a developed opposition between the Judaising and Pauline parties—we shall find that all external testimony is subjected to the same kind of arbitrary treatment, and that Steck in his depreciation of it is so far a worthy follower of Baur, however much in other respects he differs from him. In his examination of the earliest witnesses outside the New Testament, Steck is at great pains, says Gloël,[2] to transfer the first Epistle of Clement to the year 130–140 A.D., and to bring into accord with his view of the late origin of the Pauline Epistles the express reference which it contains to 1 Corinthians. But even if we put aside any decision as to the events which occasioned Clement's letters, Gloël well asks, if from the circumstance that about the year 130–140 A.D. one of the *Hauptbriefe* is first expressly named, can we draw the conclusion that the Epistle now for the first time referred to was only a recent production? Is it within the bounds of possibility that the whole Corinthian Church should thus receive, not merely one, but two forgeries without question?

According to Steck, the whole field of literature at that time, from the end of the Old Testament even to the Christian Apocrypha, was dominated by what he calls 'the law of pseudepigraphic composition,' and, in his view, it would have been miraculous if this law had not prevailed in the province of the growing Christian literature (pp. 384, 385); but if so, are we not justified, asks Gloël, in supposing that the man, whoever he was, who composed the first Epistle of Clement, whether he did so on his own authority or as a commission from the Roman Church, and who manifestly was not unacquainted with the literary life of his time, could not have entirely disregarded this law? And how then could he have been guilty of such an inconceivable piece of trifling as to describe in the most confident manner a letter

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 89. [2] *Ibid.* p. 68.

which had only recently been written, and with which he himself could only have been recently acquainted, as 'the letter of the blessed Paul the Apostle'? Is it not evident that 1 Corinthians would not have been spoken of in such terms if it had not been known and valued in the Church as an Apostolic letter for a long while past?[1]

But it is Steck's inability to appreciate the bearing of the reception by the heretic Marcion of the Pauline Epistles into his Canon which seems to have occasioned the greatest surprise. It will be noticed that Steck assigns to Marcion a long career in the West, possibly from 140–170 A.D.; and that he admits that Marcion's period of activity in Rome may date from 145 A.D., although his actual arrival in that city may be placed even earlier. At Rome 'he meets with' ten Pauline Epistles, which he recognises as the work of Paul, and this on dogmatic grounds, 'because they appeared to him to breathe the spirit of Paul.'[2] But there is no answer to the question which Zahn proposes, viz. How did Marcion know the spirit of Paul that he should recognise it in these Epistles? He could not have made its acquaintance in the Acts of the Apostles, which he rejected, and which reveal nothing less than the strong anti-Judaic Paul of Marcion. But it is not correct to say that Marcion met with ten Epistles of Paul at Rome, as if a collection already existed which only contained that number, or from which Marcion made selections. Marcion, starting from a criticism in which Steck recognises a precursor of the fundamental view of the modern Tübingen school (p. 341), appealed to the Epistle to the Galatians and asserted that a division existed between the primitive Apostles and Paul: the former were unworthy of trust because they mixed up *legalia* with the words of the Redeemer (Tert. 'Adv. Marc.' iv. 3, and Irenæus. 'Adv. Hær.' iii. 2, 2). Marcion therefore rejected all Epistles which claimed to proceed from the primitive Apostles, and only accepted those of Paul. But even these he mutilated by removing all that was not in harmony with his own views, and by purifying them from supposed Judaic falsifications and errors,

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 70.

[2] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 338 ff.

whilst he entirely rejected the Pastoral Epistles which were obviously least in sympathy with Gnostic teaching: and it was by this combined process of emendation and rejection that Marcion fixed the number of Pauline Epistles as ten.[1]

But if he thus treated the Pauline Epistles in accordance with his own needs, at one time striking out whole chapters, at another making alterations in detail, how can we understand his procedure if these Epistles had only come into existence, as Steck maintains, some ten to twenty years before?[2] It is evident that Marcion believed that these Epistles had been for a long time past in use in the Church, and indeed so long as to render it impossible to obtain a copy free from error—*i.e.* in accordance with his own views.

The period which Steck seems inclined to assign to Justin Martyr's literary activity dates from 140–160 A.D., and he readily admits that his writings show an acquaintance with the Pauline Epistles. But he lays stress upon the fact that, whilst this is the case, Justin never mentions Paul by name, and never comprehends or reflects the mind and spirit of the Apostle; and whilst expressing his agreement with Thoma's summary of the relations between Justin and the Pauline Epistles, he refuses to recognise Thoma's solution of the silence about Paul himself on the ground of Justin's attitude towards Paulinism. Thoma had compared Justin's use of the Apostle John with his use of Paul; Steck takes up this comparison, but inverts it thus: Justin uses Paul as he uses John. Thoma argued that, whilst Justin uses the Fourth Gospel, he never places it on an equality with the other Gospels, and never refers to it as the work of an Apostle: this is accounted for, in his view, because the Fourth Gospel was so recent and possessed such little authority; the same argument is applicable, in Steck's opinion, to Justin's use of the Pauline Epistles: they, too, were of such recent date and of such little authority that Justin

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung*, pp. 62, 63; Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 69 and note with references to Thoma's article in *Zeitschrift für wiss. Theol.* 1875, pp. 385-412. Comp. also Holtzmann, *Einl.* p. 479, 2. Aufl.; Weiss, *Einl.* pp. 48, 49.

[2] Zahn, *ubi supra*, p. 465.

does not once name their author, although he reads them, and uses them, as interesting literary phenomena.[1] But is it not possible to attribute Justin's silence as to Paul's authorship to a very different reason?[2] If these Pauline Epistles had been known in the Church and held in regard for a very long period, what was more likely than that Justin should adopt their phraseology, without expressly appealing to Paul by name, especially when we remember that his own controversy with Marcion carries with it the fact of his complete acquaintance with the language and theology of St. Paul, and that the use of the Pauline Epistles in Justin is characteristic of other writings which certainly belonged to the same date, or even to a later?

But there is one other witness with whom Steck deals in a manner which provokes Zahn's severest sarcasm. One of the most important testimonies to the widespread use of the Pauline letters in the Church is the 'Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians.' But Steck dismisses it as of no consequence, for 'the Polycarp-writings, the "Epistle to the Philippians" and the "Martyrdom" must be placed after the middle of the second century, since Polycarp died a martyr's death on February 23, 155.' No doubt this is true as regards the 'Martyrdom,' for, as Zahn remarks, it is usual that the full description of the end of a person's life should be written after his death. But, he asks, what of the Epistle? According to Steck the canon of criticism must henceforth run thus: 'Men always write letters either after their death, or in the last four years of their life, even if they should be almost 100 years old, as Polycarp was.'[3]

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 320–324. [2] Gloël, *ibid.*

[3] Zahn, *ubi supra*, p. 466. Gloël argues with much force that if the *Hauptbriefe* are placed as late as Steck supposes, it is impossible to conceive that even in the latter half of the second century they should have won such a general acceptance in the Church. How, *e.g.*, is it probable that, at a period when the Church of Rome was already beginning to play a prominent part, and when Peter was preferred to Paul, such an Epistle as the Galatians, in which Peter figured so unenviably, should have raised no violent objections? It would most surely have done so, unless its authority was already so firmly and so long established that nothing could disturb it (pp. 70, 71). Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 642, 2nd edit. 1890.

We have thus dwelt at some length upon Steck's views as to the mutual dependence of the *Hauptbriefe*, and upon the way in which he deals with the external evidence relating to these four Epistles, because it will be seen that the same lines of argument are to a great extent carried on by a still more recent opponent even than Steck of their authenticity. We refer to Daniel Völter, Professor of Theology in Amsterdam, already well known by his work on the Apocalypse ('Die Entstehung der Apokalypse'), to which he applied a similar disintegrating process as that which he now advocates with regard to the great Pauline Epistles.

But further likenesses between these two writers are easily discernible. They both maintain that the *Hauptbriefe* are dependent (1) upon the Gospels; (2) upon non-canonical writings; (3) upon Roman and Jewish systems of philosophy. The Gospels in their view thus help to show that the Epistles are of late origin, since the new criticism has entirely reversed the old view that the Epistles precede the Gospels. All the Gospels must be dated after the destruction of Jerusalem—Mark and the proto-Matthew still in the first century, but Luke not until after its close. According to Steck, Paul evidently knew the words of Jesus from *written* sources. It is true that 2 Corinthians and Galatians do not contribute any positive proof to support this statement,[1] and that Steck admits that some of the instances of dependence which he quotes may be fairly accounted for on other grounds.

Starting with the Romans, he prefaces his remarks with the acknowledgment that little result is to be gained from this Epistle in favour of his theory. The expression ὁδηγὸς τυφλῶν (Rom. ii. 19) reminds us of Matt. xxiii. 16, 24, xv. 14, Luke vi. 39; but the figure is too familiar to justify the conclusion that the Epistle must have derived it from the Gospels. So, too, the parallel between Rom. ii. 1 and Matt. vii. 1 is too remote to be pressed. In Rom. xii. 14, however, Steck finds a striking reference to our Gospels, and he regards the Pauline words εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς διώκοντας ὑμᾶς, εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε as a combination of

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 171, 172.

Matt. v. 44 and Luke vi. 38. Again, Rom. xiii. 8–10 contains beyond doubt a thought familiar to us in our Gospels, and the order in which the commandments are given in this passage is in striking agreement with Mark x. 19. In Steck's judgment we cannot decide whether in this same chapter, Rom. xiii. 12, the imagery is to be connected with that employed in Luke xii. 38, Matt. xxv. 6, and it must also remain doubtful whether any connection can be established between Rom. xiv. 12, λόγον δώσει περὶ ἑαυτοῦ, and Matt. xii. 36, λόγον ἀποδώσουσιν, although Steck maintains that. the warning in each passage is directed against similar failings. As a final instance Steck derives the employment of the figure of the corner-stone with reference to Christ (Rom. ix. 33) from the words of Jesus in Matt. xxi. 42, Mark xii. 10, Luke xx. 17 : the combination of Isaiah viii. 14 and xxviii. 16 is insufficient to explain the manner in which the figure is employed (comp. 1 Peter ii. 6–8), and it can only be accounted for by presupposing that the imagery of the corner-stone was well known to the author of the Epistle.[1]

1 Corinthians furnishes us with similar instances, only still more strongly expressed. Upon mere reminiscences Steck confesses that he lays no great stress, and none of those which he cites from the Gospels in this Epistle is regarded as decisive (see, *e.g.*, pp. 166, 167, where he compares 1 Cor. ii. 11 with Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22 ; 1 Cor. i. 22 with Mark viii. 11 &c. ; 1 Cor. i. 19 with Luke xi. 22 ; Matt. xi. 25, 1 Cor. iii. 10 [cf. 2 Cor. vi. 16 and v. 1], with Mark xiv. 58).

Although from these comparisons no certainty can be derived as to the dependence of the author of the Epistle in question upon our Gospels, there are others which, in Steck's judgment, establish it with tolerable security. But after discussing at some length the first of the passages upon which he relies to prove this dependence—viz. 1 Cor. vii. 10 upon Matt. v. 32, Mark x. 2, Luke xvi. 18 (see pp. 167, 168)—Steck admits that our Lord's teaching upon divorce may have been known to the writer of 1 Corinthians by *oral* tradition, and that it

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 164–166.

does not therefore prove his dependence upon our *written* Gospels (p. 168). Steck is evidently impressed with the emphatic distinction which the writer of 1 Corinthians is able to draw between the *commands* of Jesus concerning divorce, and his own judgment upon questions, such as the marriage of virgins, which had not arisen during the lifetime of Jesus (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 10 and 25). But this circumstance, while it does not prove the dependence of 1 Corinthians upon our written Gospels, does prove the accuracy of the tradition which the writer of the Epistle had received.[1]

The two other passages in 1 Corinthians which Steck discusses in support of his theory are (1) ix. 14, *οὕτως καὶ ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν*, but although he has no doubt that the injunction of Jesus (Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 7), lies at the root of Paul's expression, yet he regards it as an undecided point whether an acquaintance with the Evangelists must be presupposed, or only with oral tradition; (2) 1 Cor. xiii. 2, *ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάναι.* Here it might be fairly supposed that the last words, *ὄρη μεθιστάναι*, might be accounted for by the recollection that they formed, as Steck himself points out, a customary image amongst the Rabbis for the mastery of any apparently overwhelming difficulty: 'He is a remover of mountains,' they would say of any sagacious and learned contemporary. But, argues Steck, the expression as applied to faith is unknown to Rabbinical writers, and is one peculiarly Christian, and we may associate

[1] When Steck contends (p. 167) that the exact command that the wife should not depart from her husband (1 Cor. vii. 10) is not found in our Gospels, he entirely overlooks Mark x. 11 (as Lindemann reminds us, p. 50); and when he argues that such a command could not have been given in the lifetime of Jesus, since divorce was not allowed to the woman, it would seem probable that he fails to consider all the facts of the case (comp. Edersheim *Life and Times of the Messiah*, ii. 335, and *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 158; Stier, *Words of the Lord Jesus*, iii. 13, E. T.).

At the same time it will be noticed that Steck allows that the Apostle's command to the woman (1 Cor. vii. 10) has its sure foundation in the emphatic teaching of Jesus as to the inviolability of the marriage relationship (p. 168); for if man and wife are one flesh, and man cannot put asunder what God hath joined together, it is plain, he argues, that separation is excluded, whether it proceeds from the man or the woman.

it with the words used in Matt. xxi. and Mark xi. 23 in connection with the cursing of the fig-tree, and also with the earlier saying reported in Matt. xvii. 20, *ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ Μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ καὶ μεταβήσεται*, where *πίστις* is joined with the figure *ὄρη μεθιστάναι*. In this passage, adds Steck, we may again fall back, if we choose, upon the view that Paul had received information from oral tradition of the narrative in which Jesus speaks of the power of faith as able to remove mountains. But why, he asks, should we adopt this view, when the matter is made so clear to us by our written Gospels? It is manifest, in his opinion, that we only have recourse to it, because we suppose that the Gospels date from a much later period than the Pauline Epistles!

In his examination of 2 Corinthians, Steck commences by admitting that its contents are little suitable for allowing of comparison with the Gospels. The passage i. 17, 18 claims his special attention, and he instances parallels in Matt. v. 37 and James v. 12. But each of these passages has its special peculiarities, and although Steck evidently wishes us to believe that the Pauline expression *ἵνα ᾖ παρ' ἐμοὶ τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ* is founded upon Matt. v. 37, he confesses that it may be derived from oral tradition, or from a common mode of speech familiar, as he points out, to Greek and Roman as well as to the Jew. The other instances of dependence which Steck thinks possible do not require examination, since he himself is unable to regard them as decisive, although he argues that as the connection with the Gospels is so plainly established in 1 Corinthians, it is unlikely that the case stands otherwise with 2 Corinthians. The most important passage amongst those which Steck enumerates is 2 Cor. x. 1, where the author speaks of *πραότης καὶ ἐπιεικεία τοῦ Χριστοῦ*: here again Steck allows that the author may have derived these traits from the tradition of the character of the historical Jesus, but that they may be more easily referred to such passages in our Gospels as Matt. xi. 29 and xii. 19. Finally, in his examination of Galatians, Steck again commences with the remark that the contents of this

Epistle are little calculated to afford points of connection with the Synoptists, and he allows that there are very few passages which afford any supposition of the existence of such a connection. The passage in v. 14 might indeed be referred to Matt. xxii. 39, but it is no direct reference, since in Steck's view Galatians is dependent upon Romans, and therefore Gal. v. 14 should be referred in the first instance, not to Matthew, but to Rom. xiii. 8–10.

But after all this lengthy discussion of the words of Jesus in the Pauline Epistles, extending from pages 163–172, could there be a more striking proof of Steck's failure to establish his theory of the dependence of the Epistles upon our written Gospels than his own words ?—'We may thus, while rejecting all secondary proof, establish our view of the acquaintance of the Pauline *Hauptbriefe* with words of Jesus in written Gospels upon passages such as Rom. xii. 14, xiii. 8–10 ; 1 Cor. vii. 10, xiii. 2' (p. 172). These are all the passages upon which he can rely, and with regard to each of them the *possibility* of their derivation from *oral* sources cannot be denied.

In a somewhat later part of his book Steck made a further and still more lengthy attempt to establish the dependence of the Pauline Epistles upon the Gospel according to St. Luke, and to show that there is no longer any necessity to accept the reverse and generally accepted view, viz. that Luke was dependent upon Paul.

In the first place, he examines at considerable length the tradition of the Church Fathers (which he treats with much respect when it may be used in favour of his own views) that in such passages as Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25 ; 2 Cor. viii. 18 ; 2 Tim. ii. 8, St. Paul is referring to the Gospel of St. Luke (pp. 194 ff.). But in answer to the objection that the word *εὐαγγέλιον* in the New Testament means not a written but an oral preaching of Christ, Steck replies that in Mark i. 1, as in Rev. xiv. 6, x. 2, the word means the Gospel in some written form (!), whilst he admits that in Rom. xvi. 25 the word can be taken to mean an oral preaching, since the context *καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα κ.τ.λ.* evidently points to this. But as Steck allows that recent criticism does not much favour

the Patristic interpretation of these passages,[1] and as he himself proposes to establish his theory of the dependence of the Pauline Epistles on Luke upon quite other grounds, it is not necessary to examine this part of his argument at any greater length. But after this detailed examination of these passages, Steck at once adds that the question as to whether Luke's Gospel preceded the Pauline *Hauptbriefe* cannot be determined by such single allusions, or by the traditional judgment of the Church Fathers: it can only be proved by direct literary contact between the writings, whether such a precedence exists, and on which side the dependence lies. In this connection Steck refers to the work of the so-called 'Saxon Anonymous,'[2] which enumerates the more or less verbal coincidences between the Pauline Epistles and Luke. Such instances the Anonymous introduces in great numbers, but they require, in Steck's judgment, very careful sifting, since the author supports his argument by the minor Pauline Epistles as well as by the *Hauptbriefe*: and his attempt to show that Luke's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles are partly the work of the same pen, Steck considers to have broken down. But Steck contends that the matter can be easily decided, since the existence of these points of contact between the Pauline Epistles and Luke is admitted also by critics who argue on the ground that the dependence must be placed on the side of Luke, whose Gospel is interwoven with Pauline turns of speech. We have therefore a case, Steck argues, which often occurs, viz. that while literary dependence is easily recognised and granted, the relation of this dependence is explained by diametrically opposite theories,[3] and we must therefore inquire in detail upon which side the priority lies.

[1] Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften N. T.*, p. 168, 6. Aufl. 1887; so also P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 146.

[2] P. 202.

[3] Steck (pp. 202, 203) quotes as a parallel instance the points of contact between the writings of Justin Martyr and St. John's Gospel, and the opposite views which have been held as to their relative priority. Steck maintains that good reasons can be alleged on either side; but see Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 45, 2. Aufl.

Comp. also Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 479, 480, 2. Aufl.

One might have expected, after all this, that some very decisive proofs in support of Steck's own view would have been forthcoming. The passages, however, upon which he chiefly relies, are not only very few in number, but quite insufficient to turn the scale in favour of the priority of Luke. Steck takes, *e.g.*, Luke x. 7, 8, and compares these verses with 1 Cor. x. 27. This comparison is examined at considerable length (pp. 203–208). But although it is obvious that the verbal agreement is not so very exact as to demand that 1 Cor. x. 27 is borrowed from a *written* source, yet Steck maintains its dependence upon Luke by putting down the case of partaking of meat offered to idols as an artificial and complicated instance in proof of the simple principle enunciated in Luke's Gospel—the word *all*, in verse 27, being an addition to the original source. The probability, therefore, is that the Gospel is older than the Epistle, and only the old established prejudice to the contrary has prevented this probability from gaining acceptance.

The only other instance with regard to which Steck considers that the possibilities favour his view is that of the figure of the steward in Luke xii. 42 compared with 1 Cor. iv. 1–5. That one passage is influenced by the other is rendered in the highest degree probable by the context; in each case the conception of the steward is the same; in each case he is regarded as a teacher in contrast with the simple Christian—in 1 Corinthians he is a 'steward of the mysteries of God'; in the Gospel he is 'set over the household to give them their meat in due season' (pp. 208, 209). With regard to the other instances which he cites in this connection, Steck admits that it is much more difficult to say on which side the balance of probability lies (pp. 209, 210); but although he does not hesitate to affirm that the frequent points of connection between Luke and Paul do not appear in any single case to signify the dependence of the former upon the latter, yet in some cases a reverse dependence may with probability be shown. And this dependence is not of a kind which would be formed by recourse to old and recognised authorities, but it is occasional and by no means

slavish, and points to no great interval of time between the writings.

Certainly after this lengthy attempt on Steck's part to prove his theory of the dependence of the Epistles upon the Synoptists, his conclusions seem halting in the extreme, and if indeed, as Steck himself admits, the decisive instances of verbal connection are very few, whilst the general phraseology is very close and similar, this is exactly what we might expect if the Pauline Epistles truly expressed the teaching derived from oral tradition.

Moreover, we ought not to lose sight of the fact that Steck's conclusions follow upon his examination of two of the most important points of connection between the Gospels and 1 Corinthians, viz. the account of the Lord's Supper,[1] and also of His resurrection. It is necessary to treat briefly of Steck's method of dealing with these two accounts, because of their importance, and because much that he says has a bearing upon the following chapters.

The account of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. xi. 23–26, runs parallel with the account of the Synoptists (p. 173), and in these accounts Matthew and Mark are in close contact on the one side, and Luke and Paul on the other, and it is acknowledged that the account in Luke shows the closest agreement with that given in 1 Cor. xi. There are two questions to be answered: (1) Which is the earlier source in the points in which Paul and Luke deviate from each other? (2) Is the account of Luke and Paul more original than that of Matthew and Mark? In Steck's judgment there is much which appears to speak for the generally received view, viz. the greater originality of 1 Corinthians (pp. 174, 175), but he also thinks that there are objections to this view which hitherto have not received sufficient consideration.

Paul's account commences with the words ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, 'For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you;' in what way, asks Steck, did Paul receive his communication from Christ? Oral information from the living Jesus is of

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 172–80.

course excluded; heavenly teaching from the exalted Christ, although supported by analogy from the Apostle's own experience, in that Paul sometimes makes a boast of such revelations (Gal. i. 12, ii. 2; 2 Cor. xii. 1.), cannot be said to be in harmony with the contents of the Apostle's communication; it is difficult to suppose that a heavenly revelation would have consisted of an account so temperate and so historical. The word *παρέλαβον* points to human means, and the preposition *ἀπό* is also in favour of this view, since in distinction from *παρά* it signifies an indirect receiving. But if it means 'I received directly from the Lord,' the manner of the reception is conditioned by the manner and method of the delivery; the Apostle, we know, delivered to the Church the information which he had received through tradition, and there is nothing to hinder the view that this tradition was exactly similar to that which our Evangelists received and transmitted to wider circles. In 1 Cor. xv. 3, the information concerning the resurrection of Christ is introduced by the same expression, *παρέδωκα ὑμῖν ὃ καὶ παρέλαβον*, and in that place there can be no doubt that reference is made to the tradition of the oldest Churches. Consequently, in the case before us, the account is derived from the same source, and it is therefore just as likely that it was based upon the fixed written tradition already contained in the Gospels as upon an oral tradition still in circulation. If thus the possibility be still granted that the Pauline account may rest upon oral tradition, yet nothing in the main is opposed to the view that it may be derived from Luke's Gospel, provided that its form can be explained from such a source. Steck, as we have already seen, regards 1 Cor. xi. 23–26 as a shorter and simpler account than that of the Synoptists, and he now proceeds to mention a further ground for supposing that the information which it contains is derived from Luke. If this possibility results from an inquiry into the opening of the passage it is rendered far more probable from a consideration of its conclusion. That the monition in verse 26, *ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου καταγγέλλετε ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ*, is to be regarded as a word of Paul, and not as

an utterance of Jesus, should be plain, and this is recognised by most commentators. The modes of expression *τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου* and *ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ* favours this view, as also do the 'Apostolic Constitutions,' where these words are placed in the mouth of Jesus, with an adaptation exactly corresponding to the form employed in 1 Corinthians, *τὸν θάνατον τὸν ἐμὸν* and *ἄχρις ἂν ἔλθω*. But if verse 26 is added by Paul, and yet is to be retained as belonging to the account of the institution of the Supper, this supposition, in Steck's opinion, throws a light upon the whole formation of the account. For verse 26 manifestly establishes the conclusion of verse 25, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, since obedience to the exhortation to frequent celebration of the Supper will be the means of keeping the Lord's memory steadfast. The repetition, therefore, of the expression *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* at the distribution of the cup is connected with the Pauline addition (verse 26), and this repetition is itself an addition to the text of Luke, where the words *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* only occur at the distribution of the bread.

The text of Luke, Steck maintains, has from the commencement been regarded in an unfavourable light on account of its remarkable deviation from Matthew and Mark in its mention of two cups, and although an attempt has been made to account for this difference on the supposition that we have in Luke's Gospel an unskilful revision of two sources, Steck proceeds to show that this cannot be regarded as a satisfactory explanation. The first cup in Luke (xxii. 17) stands in the very closest connection with the first eating (verse 15), when Jesus says, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.' With this corresponds exactly the offering of a first cup with the words, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.' These two incidents are thus connected—they form in Luke a first act of the Last Supper, with the significance of a parting meal, and with a reference to a fulfilment in the kingdom of God: then

follows a second act, again consisting of eating and drinking, but now with the meaning of a memorial feast in memory of Jesus for the time between His death and His return. But we are thus able to find an explanation of the second cup: it is introduced by Luke to enrich the meaning of the action, and he was so far justified inasmuch as at the actual Jewish Paschal meal, which Jesus, according to all the Synoptists celebrated, it was customary to offer, and to drink from, not only one cup, but several—generally four—and to accompany the action with solemn words. But the account in 1 Corinthians, while it stands in connection with Luke in the rest, omits again this first act, because, after all, it did not belong properly to the matter, and Matthew and Mark do not mention it. We see, however, that 1 Corinthians was acquainted with it from the concluding admonition, *ὁσάκις γὰρ κ.τ.λ.* Here we have, only in another form, the reference to the future coming of the Lord, which in the first act of Luke's account is contained in the twice repeated words: *ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ* (verses 16, 18). Whilst the account in 1 Corinthians omits the rest of this first act as a mere anticipation of the words of institution, it preserves in its conclusion this definite reference to the words in verses 16, 18. We thus have, in Steck's view, in 1 Corinthians not merely the simplest, but rather a *simplified* account of the Lord's Supper based upon Luke, and retaining his description essentially, although in smaller details abbreviated, so that a short and simple representation is the result, which could be used to a certain extent as a standing formula for communication to the Churches.

But in this conclusion Steck does not seem to be so very far removed from that advocated by Godet and Dr. Salmon,[1] viz. that Luke gives us the words which he had heard Paul use in celebrating the Holy Communion—words which might naturally be described as 'a standing formula for communication to the Churches.' It should also be remembered that, in

[1] See below, chap. vi. p. 352 ff., for further comment on the words of institution.

Holtzmann's view, the words in Luke bear the stamp of genuineness, and he thinks that they may be easily explained by regarding them as a combination of the Pauline and Synoptical narrative; for the Pauline account he holds that Luke was dependent simply upon 'the preaching of Paul' (*κήρυγμα Παύλου*) in which the report of the Last Supper had received a fixed form.[1] This view that Luke's account may be fairly described as a combination of preceding traditions—*e.g.* those received from Mark and Paul—is strongly supported by Gloël,[2] and it has also recommended itself to Weiss, in his 'Leben Jesu.'[3] At least it may be said that, whatever may have been the precise source from which Luke received the words, we are by no means shut up to the conclusion demanded by Steck.

But the account of the Resurrection appearances in 1 Cor. xv. is discussed by Steck at still greater length.[4] He points out, first of all, the importance which this account in 1 Cor. xv. 1–11 has assumed in the modern vision-theory (p. 180); he regards it as the lever by which modern criticism has undertaken to do away with the realistic accounts of the Resurrection contained in the Gospels, and he considers that the confidence with which the holders of the vision-theory maintain their view is based upon the fact that 1 Corinthians precedes the Gospel narratives. But all this, he says, must be rendered uncertain immediately the Pauline composition of this account in 1 Corinthians is disputed, and thus an unsuspected danger threatens criticism on one of its most important points. Steck acknowledges that, as a matter of fact, the account in question is sufficiently remarkable and peculiar to awaken a favourable predisposition in favour of its antiquity; it gives, after some introductory remarks, a formal list of six appearances, of which only a minority could possibly be identified

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 395, 396; see below, chap. vi. p. 352.

[2] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 51, where he points out that 'the plain reader,' so far from feeling himself compelled to adopt Steck's conclusions, will much rather be inclined to the view mentioned in the text as he reads Mark xiv. 24 (cf. Matt. xxvi. 28), 1 Cor. xi. 25, compared with Luke xxii. 20.

[3] See chap. vi. p. 352.

[4] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 180–91.

with those of the Gospels, while the majority are quite peculiar to this passage.[1]

But although it is thus evident at the very outset that it would be a futile attempt to derive it from our Gospels, specially from Luke, yet, he says, we must not omit to inquire how far some elements of this remarkable account may be connected with the account in our Gospels, especially with that given by Luke.[2] The first point of coincidence is to be found in the opening statement that Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture. This statement corresponds with the teaching of the Risen One to His disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 26, 27), and the Scripture proof for the death of Jesus on the cross, although everywhere presupposed, is nowhere so expressly alluded to as in this passage of the third Evangelist. The second point of agreement is one to which Steck refers in company with many commentators who would widely dissent from many of his conclusions. The appearance to Cephas, which Paul mentions first (1 Cor. xv. 5), is not referred to by Matthew or Mark; but, on the other hand, Luke (xxiv. 34) tells us how the two disciples return from Emmaus to Jerusalem and are received by the others with the joyful cry, 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared unto Simon,' where, indeed, the expression 'hath appeared unto Simon' strikingly reminds us of 1 Cor. xv. 5 (ὤφθη Κηφᾷ). A third point of agreement which can be detected between the two accounts consists in the mention by Luke of an appearance to the Apostles after the return of the travellers from Emmaus, and the mention of an appearance to 'the twelve' in 1 Cor. xv. 5. But here Steck considers it necessary to point out that the agreement is not quite exact, since in Luke the appearance is vouchsafed, not only to the Twelve or to the Eleven, but to others assembled with them (Luke xxiv. 9), and of the Emmaus disciples, who were certainly amongst those thus assembled, one, at any rate, did not belong

[1] See chap. vii. for a further discussion of these appearances.

[2] See below, chap. vii. p. 375, where Holtzmann reverses the relationship between Luke and Paul, and points out the many instances of agreement between their two accounts of the Resurrection appearances.

to the Twelve. Of the other appearances recorded in 1 Corinthians, those to the five hundred, to James, to the assembled Apostles, are entirely unknown to Luke [1] and the two other Synoptists, for it is by no means satisfactory to identify the appearance to the five hundred with the farewell scene at Christ's Ascension, or with the events of the first Christian Pentecost.[2] We must therefore decide that 1 Corinthians appears to be independent of Luke, at any rate in the form in which we now have it; but we cannot therefore hastily jump to the conclusion that we have before us a report of incomparably greater historical value, which goes back to the earliest days of the Church, and which may even possibly be based upon a communication of the original Apostles. Steck accordingly proceeds to enumerate the different weak points in this passage (1 Cor. xv.). It is certainly difficult to believe that a serious argument can be based upon some of them, but we will take them in the order given by Steck himself. In the first place, he takes objection to the way in which the account is introduced, and repeats the objection raised by Bruno Bauer ('Kritik der paulin. Briefe,' 2. Abth. p. 70)—viz. that we do not 'make known' again what has once been preached to the members of a Church, but 'remind' them of it, if there is reason to believe that they have forgotten it. Steck, therefore, considers it probable that fresh information is here represented as already known to the Church, because it is not to be supposed that Paul had said nothing of it on an earlier occasion.

The second point of objection is to be found in the fact that Paul narrates the appearance to himself as that which he also 'received,' as if it belonged to the elements of the Apostolic testimony to the Resurrection. No doubt, says Steck, Paul placed the appearance vouchsafed to himself on a level with the older appearance of the Risen Saviour, but it is doubtful whether it so presented itself to the primitive Church. According, however, to the account in 1 Corinthians, this cycle

[1] See, however, the passage in Holtzmann's *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, to which reference has just been made.

[2] See below, chap. vii. p. 373.

of appearances was acknowledged and defended by both Apostolic circles, the Jerusalem and the Pauline (1 Cor. xv. 11). But it is quite unlikely, in Steck's judgment, that the primitive Apostles included the appearance to Paul amongst the main facts of their preaching, or that he so included those appearances vouchsafed to them, especially when we consider that, while Paul based his Apostleship upon the appearance granted to him, his opponents violently contested his claim to have seen the Lord, and upbraided him with his familiarity with 'visions and revelations' (2 Cor. xi. 19, xii. 1, 5, 13, and 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2).[1] The report is therefore artificially and purposely constructed to show that no difference existed in the appearances vouchsafed to Paul and the Twelve.

The third point which demands attention is that in this Pauline account the burial of Jesus is expressly testified just as in our Gospels. The supporters of the vision-theory regard the report of the burial of Jesus in the Gospels as a proof that the accounts of His resurrection had already received a widespread material interpretation, but the ἐτάφη of 1 Corinthians shows that, at least as far as the grave of Jesus is concerned, the Pauline account stands on a level with that of the Gospels; how, then, Steck would have us ask ourselves, can it be so much older?

In the fourth place Steck notes the absence from the Pauline account of the announcement common to the Gospel narratives of the Resurrection through the women who found the grave empty. Whether this last detail, he says, is held to be important or not, the *rôle* which the women played in the rise of the belief in the Resurrection is, at all events, not to be undervalued, and it forms an integral part of the whole history.[2] Paul, therefore, it is generally assumed, would not deny this active share of the women, but he consciously

[1] See chap. vii. p. 383 ff.

[2] With regard to these last two points, as Gloël well puts it, Steck surely deserves that we should agree with him when he lays stress upon the fact that the Pauline ἐτάφη and the mention of the five hundred brethren presents greater difficulty to the modern vision-theory than is generally admitted; he likewise ought to carry us with him when he attributes much more credit to 'the simple Gospel

omits it on judicious grounds, so as not, as Hase puts it, to introduce what opponents could call women's prattle. As a matter of fact, adds Steck, not only did the disciples, according to the Gospels (Luke xxiv. 11), at first regard the announcement of the women as 'idle tales,' but at a later date Celsus fixed upon this incident as the starting-point of his attack upon the belief of the Christians. And so, Steck concludes, the omission of the message of the women by Paul already indicates an artificial structure in the story of the Resurrection; and here, too, we have another proof that the Gospels present us with a more naïve account.[1]

Passing to his fifth count—the appearance of the Risen One to more than five hundred at once—Steck frankly admits that the mention of this incident places more difficulty in the way of the vision-hypothesis than is generally allowed. This 'appearance' evidently puzzles him, and he seems inclined to think it possible to connect it with some scene like that of the first Christian Pentecost, and to regard it merely as a being filled with the Holy Ghost. But if this interpretation is admitted, then Steck asks us to give a preference to the Acts of the Apostles, since there the narrative does not involve an actual vision of Christ.[2]

The sixth difficulty is presented by the appearance vouchsafed to James, which is placed fourth in the Pauline list, but which is nowhere else mentioned in the New Testament. Steck points out that a reference is found to it in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, in a passage quoted by Jerome, but that this is the only mention of it in early Christian literature. But if a parallel to this appearance had only been found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews this would hardly, he thinks, have entitled it to credit, since this extra-canonical Gospel is scarcely older than our Gospels, even if it presents in some few details a more original source. But

reports' (p. 191) of the message of the women than is allowed, for the most part, by modern criticism (*ubi supra*, p. 54).

[1] For the probable reason of St. Paul's omission of the appearance to the women, see chap. vii. p. 376.

[2] See, however, note above for Gloël's criticism; and for an examination of the appearance to the five hundred, see chap. vii. pp. 374, 376.

amongst these details, he adds, we surely cannot reckon the strange and insipid account of the Resurrection. Yet in Steck's opinion, this circumstance of the mention of the appearance to James in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, furnishes us with a very instructive hint as to the composition of the whole Pauline account of the Resurrection, for although in our Gospels no reminiscence of this particular appearance can be discovered, yet here again Luke approaches nearest to the Pauline passage, 1 Cor. xv. In proof of this opinion Steck continues: In Acts i. Luke gives an account of the departure of the Risen One from His disciples on the Mount of Olives, and then mentions the names of the first disciples: in the first instance, the Twelve, as those who were present at the Ascension, and who afterwards returned to Jerusalem (Acts i. 12, 13); in verse 14 he adds: 'these all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and *with his brethren*.' James is without doubt included amongst the brethren of Jesus: and so, says Steck, it is here intimated to us that already at a brief interval after the Resurrection, James was in Jerusalem and a member of the Church, as at a later period, both in the Acts and other ecclesiastical literature, as well as by Paul, he is named as a head of the Church in that city by the side of Peter and John. Steck points out that this is the only passage in the New Testament from which we learn that James and the other brethren of Jesus had already made the Christian cause their own, and he adds that Luke can only have received this tradition from a good source. But Steck is convinced that such incidents as these must lead to the opinion that the first part of the Lucan Acts, as well as the second, is based upon older sources: some Jewish Christian Acts, or a Gospel in some older form—perhaps, as Volkmar thinks, the 'Preaching of Peter.' From this writing, according to Steck, the Acts is here derived, and the account in 1 Corinthians may also have come to us from the same source.[1]

[1] See, however, for the appearance to James, chap. vii. p. 372, and Gloël's criticism of Steck, *ubi supra*, p. 55. As Gloël points out, there is no reason why we should adopt Steck's view of the agreement between Luke and Paul; it is sufficiently accounted for on the supposition of an oral tradition.

Another detail which, in Steck's opinion, points in the same direction is the appearance to Peter mentioned by Luke in xxiv. 34. This appearance is presupposed, but it is not previously narrated in Luke's Gospel, and neither Luke xxiv. 12 nor John xx. 6 can be said to account for the expression 'he appeared unto Simon' (ὤφθη Σίμωνι). As, therefore, Steck argues, this expression does not occur at all in Luke, it is easily conceivable that an opinion should have been formed to the effect that the words found their way into the Gospel out of 1 Cor. xv. 5. But, he adds, another solution is quite possible, viz. that both Luke and 1 Cor. xv. are based upon the account of the older source which, as Steck holds, was used by Luke in the beginning of the Acts.

An additional proof of this view is found by Steck in a fragment of the Gospel of the Hebrews which Jerome introduces in addition to the above-named passage, a fragment which is given in Greek in the Letter of Ignatius to the Church of Smyrna, iii. 2, and which also Eusebius introduces ('Eccles. Hist.' iii. 36, 11), as taken by Ignatius from an unknown source. In another place also (*Comm. in Isai.* lib. xviii. *Prol.*) Jerome introduces the passage as derived from the Hebrew or Nazarene Gospel, so that there can be no doubt as to its origin. In the Greek text of Ignatius we find the words: 'and when he came to those around Peter he said to them: "Take hold of me, handle me, and see that I am not a bodiless spirit"' (Steck, p. 189); to these words Luke's account alone of all the Resurrection narratives in the Gospels affords a parallel (xxiv. 39), and even if the agreement in the two accounts is not entire, it is so in the chief fact, viz. in the demand of Jesus to His disciples that they should handle Him, as a convincing proof that He was no mere spirit (Steck, p. 190). It is therefore probable, Steck argues, that both the beginning of the Acts and the account of the Resurrection given in Luke point back to some older source, from which the ὤφθη Σίμωνι (Luke xxiv. 34), the ψηλαφήσατέ με (verse 39) and the mention of James (Acts i. 14) are derived. But if this is so, he maintains that nothing hinders the view that the Pauline account in 1 Cor. xv. has also derived its peculiarities

from this source, and so in no way need it be much older than Luke.

Thus, in Steck's opinion, the account of the Resurrection, equally with that of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians is artificially simplified and arranged, and we can by no means regard it as the primary or oldest source ; it is wanting in the incident of the message of the women, an incident undoubtedly historical ; it shows in the appearance to James a connection with the Apocryphal literature of the early Church ; and, finally, it is in its whole drift evidently so arranged that it may pass as the joint preaching of the Jewish Apostles and Paul. The three names which characterise the parties of the Apostolic age—Peter, James, Paul—are each associated with a separate appearance of the Risen One, and between these individual appearances are arranged those in which larger circles participated—Peter, the Twelve, the five hundred, James, all the Apostles, Paul. With Peter as leader are associated the Twelve, and then in immediate succession the five hundred, just as in Luke ix. 1 the Twelve, and then in x. 1 the Seventy are sent out by Jesus. James begins a new series, and with him are associated the Apostles collectively, since under the term 'Apostles' both he and still later additions to the Christian Church could be included, as in Gal. i. 19 James is reckoned among the Apostles, and in Acts xiv. 14 Paul and Barnabas are called by the same title. Paul himself forms the conclusion, and he is thus significantly ranked among the first witnesses, and takes his place by the side of the two other selected Apostles, Peter and James. The report is therefore much more designed and artificial than it appears at first sight, and there is no reason why it should be preferred to the far simpler Gospel narratives.[1]

[1] For the probable meaning of Paul's selection of the appearances of the Risen Christ see below, chap. vii. p. 376. As Gloël justly remarks, it is no doubt true enough that Paul's account is dominated by an apologetic aim; but this is no reason why it should be assigned to a later date. Steck's view of the Resurrection appearances has been recently criticised very severely by Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. erste Abtheilung, ii. Hälfte, pp. 155, 156 (1891). Schmiedel reminds us at the outset that Steck in his account of these appearances does not venture to affirm a dependence upon the Gospels as he does in the case

Amongst other particulars which Steck adduces against the early date of the *Hauptbriefe*, but which, as he confesses, cannot alone be considered as convincing, there is one which forms, as he says, an integral part of the plan of these Epistles, and the significance of which cannot be disputed, viz. their Christology.[1] It is true that in the Epistles of the Captivity the divine side of the Person and work of Christ is more and more developed, and His significance in the scheme of the universe.

But Steck insists that even in the *Hauptbriefe* this aspect of His Person and work is by no means wanting. Not only is His new and higher existence the result of His resurrection, just as in the Acts he is described as a man from God, mighty in word and deed, and exalted after His resurrection to be the Judge of quick and dead, but in the *Hauptbriefe* Jesus is the Lord of Glory not only after His earthly life but before it. That these Epistles contain this doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus must, in Steck's judgment, be regarded as a settled matter : passages such as 1 Cor. xv. 47, 2 Cor. viii. 9, 1 Cor. viii. 6, Rom. v. 14, 2 Cor. iv. 4, admit of no doubt ; and we can refer, as Steck himself urges, to the treatises on New Testament theology of such writers as B. Weiss and Pfleiderer, who, starting from very different standpoints, yet agree in the conclusion that in Paul a highly developed representation of the Person of Christ is found, which in many respects borders upon the highest New Testament conceptions of His divinity,

of 1 Cor. xi. 17 ff. He then proceeds to criticise in detail Steck's attempts to prove a priority on the part of the Gospels—attempts which Schmiedel evidently considers quite inadequate to support Steck's attack upon 1 Corinthians. He points out, *e.g.*, that, even if 1 Cor. xv. 7 and the appearance vouchsafed to James in the Gospel according to the Hebrews (comp. Luke xxiv. 39) may be referred to a common source, which Steck describes as a good source, this affords no proof whatever of the spuriousness of 1 Corinthians, and with regard to Steck's final attack upon the whole section 1 Cor. xv. 1–11 (which Schmiedel regards as our oldest and most reliable report), viz. that it is artificially composed to show that the Jewish Apostles and Paul preached a common gospel, he remarks that there is little force in the parallels of the Twelve and the five hundred with the Twelve and the Seventy in Luke ix. and x. and that there is no such reason, as Steck alleges, why, after the mention of the Twelve and the five hundred, a fresh series of appearances should commence with James. See also Lindemann, *ubi supra*, p. 51

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 276–87.

viz. the Johannine, although Paul never declares with John, '*the Word was made flesh*.'

But in these Epistles Steck maintains that we reach the point at which Christ's pre-existent life in glory is added to His glorified resurrection life; and when He is described as the antitype of the first man, the second Adam, the second man from heaven, such expressions intimate that He was in heaven, and of a heavenly nature, before He came down to earth. So, too, Steck explains most emphatically the passage in Phil. ii. 6, of Christ's pre-existence, and, more remarkable still, he admits that it is difficult to explain away such statements as 1 Cor. viii. 6, in which Christ is described as the instrument of the world's creation, and he proposes to interpret even 1 Cor. x. 4, as meaning that in Paul's conception Christ was already a pre-existent Person, exercising His redemptive activity at the time of the Old Covenant.

In the next chapter reference is again made to these passages, and to Steck's view that Paul was probably acquainted with the details of the Incarnation recorded by the Synoptists. Of course, all these admissions, to which must be added Steck's interpretation of Rom. ix. 5,[1] are only meant to show that, in his belief, the *Hauptbriefe* contain a high Christology, quite incompatible with the supposition of their alleged early date, and far exceeding the representation of Christ's Person given us by the Synoptists; but they are at least useful as a proof that on the grounds of exegesis Steck is unable to find any valid objection to the most orthodox interpretations of Paul's Christology. But Steck urges further the impossibility that such a perfected Christology as that of the *Hauptbriefe* could proceed from a contemporary of Jesus: only those, in his opinion, who find no difficulty in ascribing the Johannine Christology to one of His immediate disciples could come to any other conclusion. Steck allows that this high Christology of Paul is said to be accounted for by the way in which the

[1] Steck even defends at length (pp. 284–287) the reference of ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός to Christ in Rom. ix. 5 on exegetical grounds, although he evidently regards ch. ix.–xi. as one of the later of those sections out of which he holds that the *Hauptbriefe* were composed.

Apostle became a follower of Christ by a sudden bound, on the supposition that his Christian consciousness was formed quite apart from the historical Jesus and His disciples, and by his reflection upon the fundamental facts of the Crucifixion and Resurrection: on these grounds a higher dogmatic development in the Apostle's thought would no doubt be conceivable. But, against all this, Steck points to his own examination of the Galatian Epistle, to the consciously designed contrast between this Epistle and the Acts, and to its intention of making the Pauline Gospel quite independent of human influences. The historical Paul could not, he thinks, have thus developed his thoughts, and his dependence upon the Apostolic circle was too natural, and too much a matter of course, to be ignored.

But when Steck speaks of the 'historical Paul,' it is not easy, on his own showing, to see upon what *data* he could speak with any certainty of a person whose existence he has reduced to little more than a shadow, and when he denies that this 'historical' Paul could have composed the Christology of the *Hauptbriefe*, it is perhaps pardonable to apply Steck's own criticism to himself: 'Such a conception of the development of Paul's thought is like that of a philosophical system constructed by a German philosopher in his study, but it has no place in the living current of history' (p. 283). The passage 2 Cor. v. 16 is best understood, according to Steck, as containing a reference to the early external conception of the Messiah according to his earthly being, into the place of which, for advanced Christians, the Christ has stepped who is *the Lord, the Spirit* (2 Cor. iii. 17); the first conception was that of the historical Paul, which he shared with the men of his time. This historical Paul had very probably, if he had grown up in Jerusalem (Acts xx. 3), been present at the Crucifixion, and had, at any rate, received some passing impression of the historical Jesus, for it is quite arbitrary, says Steck, to banish him from Jerusalem, only with the view of removing him as far as possible from all personal contact with Jesus. But the Paul of the *Hauptbriefe* who avoids all that is historical in the Person of Jesus, according to Steck, is a pure dogmatist,

and therefore not the Apostle. But again we are compelled to demur to Steck's conclusions, since, in the first place, we must repeat the doubt as to how he could have any definite knowledge of the historical Paul, and of the extent of his information about Jesus the Messiah: if he refers us to the Acts, this is not only a strange change of front with regard to the trustworthiness of that book, but it is also evident that the Paul of the Acts was not contented with the Messianic conceptions of the men of his time, since the Jews are represented as his most constant and bitter opponents; and, in the next place, it is nothing but an arbitrary assumption that the Paul of the *Hauptbriefe* avoids all that is historical in the Person of Jesus.

It can scarcely be maintained that Steck's argument is advanced by his attempted proof of the dependence of the *Hauptbriefe* upon extra-canonical writings. He specially mentions two, the 'Assumptio Mosis' and 4 Esdras.

The passage upon which Steck chiefly relies is Romans ii. 15, but its connection with the 'Assumptio Mosis,' i. 12, 13 (which Steck places at a much later date than that assigned to it by Schürer) is far too general to allow us to build a theory of dependence upon it. Loman, it will be remembered, had anticipated Steck's argument from this passage, but even Scholten was unable to recognise any validity in his reasonings. Indeed, Steck can only speak of Rom. ii. 15 as pointing to a probable acquaintance of the writer of the Epistle with the 'Assumptio Mosis,' and he admits that the passage is itself surrounded with so much doubt as to make it hazardous to build too much upon this one trace of acquaintance. The only other proof which Steck attempts—viz. a connection between Gal. iii. 19, 20, and the 'Assumptio Mosis' in the use of the term 'mediator' (*μεσίτης*) of Moses—fails entirely to convince even Loman, and therefore it need not detain us. It is no wonder that Steck speaks of 'a truly modest result' which follows from the examination of these two passages to which his proof is limited.[1] He endeavours, however, to supply the lack of positive proof by arguing that, as we

[1] Steck, *ubi supra*, pp. 226, 227.

only possess the first part of the 'Assumptio Mosis,' and even that in an unsatisfactory condition, the lost half may contain passages used in the *Hauptbriefe*; and this, he maintains, is no mere empty opinion, but one supported by ancient testimony. When we examine this testimony, we find that it consists of two references to two Byzantine authors of the ninth century—Syncellus and Photius. The passage in the Epistles chiefly relied upon is Gal. vi. 15. Steck himself seems puzzled to know how such a statement, although abrogating the value of circumcision, could have found a place in an entirely Jewish Apocalypse. But the two authors to whom Steck refers are themselves dependent upon the information of Euthalius (fifth century), a circumstance which appears to have escaped Steck's attention. Moreover, it will be noticed that Syncellus uses an expression which makes it doubtful whether he means the 'Assumptio Mosis' at all, since he speaks of *ἀποκάλυψις*, and not *ἀνάληψις*; and the indefinite expression of Euthalius, *Μωσέως ἀπόκρυψις*, may at all events comprehend several other post-Christian Apocrypha, akin to the 'Assumptio,' which bore the name of Moses. But even if Euthalius had thought of the 'Assumptio Mosis,' the form in which the writing lay before him must have been one which had been enriched by many Christian additions from the New Testament.[1]

But Steck lays great stress upon Hilgenfeld's view that the 'Assumptio Mosis' presupposes 4 Esdras, and therefore is itself of later date. In further support of his case Steck is thus obliged to examine the last-mentioned Apocryphal work, and Hilgenfeld's testimony is again referred to at length. But it is most important for us to bear in mind that Hilgenfeld regards 4 Esdras as a pre-Christian document. No doubt, if we accept the opinion which places the date of this book during the reign of Domitian, and if, on the supposition of such a late date, the dependence of the Pauline Epistles upon it could be proved, then Steck would have

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 57, 58.

For a recent summary of views as to the date and contents of the *Assumptio Mosis* see Deane's *Pseudepigrapha* (T. and T. Clark, 1891), pp. 95–130.

brought forward a strong argument in proof of his position. But when we come to examine the passages which, according to Hilgenfeld, afford instances of a connection between the Pauline Epistles and 4 Esdras, we find that, with one exception, Steck himself regards them as easily explainable on other grounds than the dependence of the former upon the latter. Even this exception Steck can only describe as making the dependence very probable (p. 234). The parallel is between Rom. x. 6, 7 and 4 Esdras 4, 8. But why should not Paul be here referring to Deut. xxx. 11–14, the connection with which is admitted by Steck? Rom. x. 8 contains an exact quotation from this passage in Deuteronomy, and if mention is made in Deuteronomy of a going up into heaven and a journey over the sea, it was easy to replace the latter expression by the going down into the deep of Rom. x. 7, which fitted well with the context, and was an expression naturally derived from the Old Testament, where it is used as the opposite of heaven.[1]

Let us next inquire whether Steck is more successful in his attempt to prove the dependence of Paul upon Philo and Seneca. It should of course be remembered at the outset that even if the influence of Philo's writings and his modes of expression and phraseology were plainly seen in Paul's Epistles, it would be no argument against their authenticity.

At the same time it may safely be asserted that none of the instances alleged by Steck are sufficient to prove any such influence. Not one single case can be made out of an actual borrowing from Philo, although there are numerous cases in which the same imagery is employed, and expressions of the same general kind. But these points of contact do not involve a literary dependence, and they may easily be accounted for when we remember that the writers in question are two men, both at home in the Old Testament and in the Judaism of their day, and both acquainted with Hellenistic Greek.[2] Is it, *e.g.*, strange that at a time when the games of the arena played such an important part, both Paul and

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 56, 57. [2] *Ibid.* p. 59.

Philo—each, however, in his own special way—should transfer to the spiritual province the imagery of the combatant in the games striving for the mastery? Is it necessary to suppose in such a case that the writer of 1 Corinthians borrowed from Philo?[1]

But Steck claims to have discovered a particularly striking instance, in which the writer of Romans ix.–xi. has borrowed from Philo, and he would have us regard the imagery of the olive-tree in those chapters as identical with that which we find in Philo, 'with slight variations.' But, to say nothing of the fact that such a figure might easily be derived from the Old Testament, it is very evident on closer examination that Paul and Philo are not employing the same but two different kinds of imagery. Paul is describing how the Jews as old branches have broken away from the olive-tree, and the heathen are grafted in as new branches. Philo is describing how new shoots spring forth from branches which have been cut off, if the roots have not been destroyed, out of which the old trees again acquire prosperity; and, so, too, if some few seed-corns of virtue remain in the soul, even if others go to ruin, yet nevertheless out of the few all that is best and noblest amongst men grows up. It would surely be strange to affirm that we have here a decisive proof of literary dependence.

The hypothesis of a dependence of the Pauline writings upon Seneca had been already maintained by Bruno Bauer, and it is revived by Steck.[2] Points of connection, he remarks, between Seneca and Christian, especially Pauline, views, had long ago been discovered, and hence arose the legend of a correspondence, and even of a meeting, between the Roman and the Christian philosopher. Undoubtedly, as Steck is himself obliged to admit (p. 248), the opinion has again been recently maintained that Seneca borrowed from the Pauline Epistles. But the points of connection between the two writers are far too general in their character to allow us to believe that one was influenced by the other. We cannot, *e.g.*, seriously argue, with Steck, that the exhortation in Rom. xiii.

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 59. [2] Steck, *ibid.* pp. 249–265.

14, *ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*, is a mere echo of Seneca's exhortation 'indue magni viri animum' ('Epist.' 67); the figure employed is certainly not so strange that two authors could not independently have lighted upon it. Is it not far more probable that the Pauline expression was derived from the Old Testament? (comp. *e.g.* Isaiah lix. 17, see also 1 Thess. v. 8, and Ephes. vi. 14, where the reference to Isaiah lix. 17 [LXX] is evident). And yet this is among the most noteworthy parallels which Steck adduces.[1]

One other instance, which Steck mentions, serves to mark most clearly the distinction between the confidence of the Christian and the apathy of the Stoic. According to Steck (p. 256), the likeness between Rom. viii. 35 and a word of Seneca ('Epist.' 85) can scarcely be accidental. And yet, it is not too much to say that the joyful certainty of triumph in which a believing heart is comforted in every trial by the never-failing love of God is as far removed as heaven from earth from the apathy with which the Stoic denies that evil is really evil![2] But it is strange, as Gloël points out, that, whilst Steck himself recognises the essential differences between the writings of the philosophers and the New Testament, he yet does not hesitate to explain the points of contrast between Paul and Seneca on the ground of the acquaintance of the author of the Pauline Epistles with the writings of the Roman philosopher. How can we reconcile these judgments except on the supposition that Steck is actuated by the wish to gain in every possible way proofs to support his hypothesis?[3] Indeed, as the same critic, Gloël, acutely observes, whilst writers like Steck are hasty enough in drawing conclusions as to literary points of contact between single books of the New Testament and other writings, such haste is frequently not in accord with the cool reserve with which the literary influence of the New Testament writings upon the literature of the Apostolic Fathers and others is estimated. In Steck's case there is a manifest inclination to maintain to the utmost the literary dependence of the Pauline Epistles upon other writ-

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, pp. 61, 62.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 62. [3] *Ibid.* p. 63.

ings, and, on the other hand, to weaken as far as possible the testimony in support of the influence of these Epistles upon Patristic literature.[1]

Part III

But Steck's references to Philo and Seneca are also of interest in connection with the more recent attack upon the *Hauptbriefe* by Daniel Völter.[2] In many of his arguments Völter follows closely in the steps of Steck, but it is of importance to notice that he is much more inclined to admit that many of Steck's alleged instances of the dependence of the Pauline Epistles upon Philo and Seneca may be explained by the common use of Old Testament language, or by the philosophic atmosphere of the period.

In a short introduction to his work [3] Völter refers to what he considers as the most remarkable phenomenon in New Testament criticism—the increasing attacks upon the *Hauptbriefe*. Völter makes allusion, like Steck, to previous labourers in the same field; but it will be observed that he confesses that he was not only dissatisfied with Loman's arguments, which seemed to exclude creative religious personalities altogether, and with those of Pierson and Naber, which degenerated into a mere subjective fantasy, but also at first with those of Steck. Nevertheless, the position maintained by the last-mentioned writer seems to have gradually forced upon him the conviction that the question as to the genuineness of the *Hauptbriefe* could no longer be dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders or a few cheap generalities, and he now claims to institute an entirely new and unprejudiced inquiry into the subject.

But when we examine the grounds upon which Völter decides to reject the Epistle to the Romans, it will be seen

[1] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 67.

[2] *Die Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, i. 'Der Römer- und Galaterbrief,' 1890.

[3] *Ubi supra*, pp. 1–7.

that they are arbitrary in the extreme. It must be carefully remembered that, after all is said and done, Völter is himself obliged to recognise a brief original Epistle as the actual work of the historical Paul.[1] But he commences his attack upon the Epistle as we have it by finding fault with its length. This seems to him far more fitting for a scientific treatise than for a letter addressed to a Church which Paul had not founded, and with which he was not personally acquainted. It is therefore a question whether the epistolary form is not fictitious, or whether longer or shorter passages have not been interpolated in the original letter. The Epistle, too, is open to further suspicion on account of the different views which have been entertained as to its readers and as to its aim.

But Völter thinks that all difficulties are removed if we reconstruct the Epistle according to his arguments.[2] By recovering what he terms the original letter we get rid of the strange length of the Epistle, and we gain a clear idea of the character of its readers. They are evidently heathen Christians with a minority of Jewish Christians, a view which agrees with the conclusion of the Acts. The aim of the letter is also plain. The Roman Church is a Gentile Christian community which had arisen without Paul's direct action, but which in its nature falls within his province of work: he has always hoped to visit it, and anticipates that he will soon be able to do so. With such a Church Paul would of necessity sympathise, and would contribute something to its Christian belief and Christian life, in order to show himself the father of Gentile Christians in this Church as in others; he would naturally enter into personal relations with its members, and prepare them beforehand for his coming. With all this Völter argues that the original Roman Epistle exactly corresponds. This original letter consists of ch. i. 1[a]; i. 7; i. 5, 6; i. 8–17; ch. v. and vi. (except v. 13, 14; v. 20 and vi. 14, 15); ch. xii. xiii.; xv. 14–32; xvi. 21–23.[3]

The conception of Christianity which the author of this 'original' letter puts forward is as follows: the Gospel of Jesus Christ is a power of God for all believers, for the Jew

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 45–50. [2] *Ibid.* p. 44. [3] *Ibid.*

first and also for the Gentile. In Christ alone is salvation, for the whole of humanity is under the dominion of sin and death, which entered into the world with the fall of Adam. The judgment of God upon the fall and disobedience of Adam is a condemnatory judgment upon the whole human race, by which all men are reckoned as sinners deserving the penalty of death. But a great turning-point in the history of humanity commences with Christ. By the obedience of the one man Jesus Christ many are made righteous ; for the verdict upon the obedience of this one man is the justification of the whole of humanity—a justification unto life. The man Jesus stands out from the whole sinful race of humanity (which is connected with Adam by bodily descent and inherits the taint of his nature) as alone obedient unto God—obedient even unto death. Here is the proof that this man was the Christ, the Son of God, chosen to carry out His will in the work of salvation, and who had with this object faithfully surrendered Himself even unto death. But that God should thus give up this righteous One unto death can only be understood as His loving purpose to reconcile us to Himself whilst we were yet enemies, and to justify us through the blood of Christ. The Messiahship and Sonship of Jesus, as also the saving significance of His death, are confirmed by His Resurrection ; the Risen Jesus lives unto God, as a willing instrument to further His purposes. The grace of God offered to mankind in Christ is appropriated by faith, and the believer is conscious of peace with God, being justified by faith, and is filled with hope of the future glory of God, which hope is only confirmed by tribulations, and has its sure guarantee in the love of God, of which the Holy Spirit given to believers is a living and abiding witness. But for a man thus justified, a mode of life is fitting which corresponds to that state of grace in which he is placed. He who believes that Christ has died for his sins must recognise that his old man is crucified with Christ that the body of sin might be destroyed. This dying with Christ is symbolised for the Christian in baptism : but he who is thus dead with Christ must advance further to the belief that he stands in relation

to the Christ raised from the dead, and that he must live in fellowship with Him. This service of righteousness, this sanctification, is the spiritual service of God whereby the body is presented as a sacrifice holy, acceptable to God, and the Spirit proves what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God. For a knowledge of this will of God the law with its moral claims must ever be the highest and best source, the law which is fulfilled through love: and this whole new life of the justified is a life in the Holy Spirit, which is not only the constant source of our consciousness of justification and reconciliation of our consciousness of the love of God, but also a power of sanctification, of brotherly love, a power in word and deed, in signs and wonders wrought in the service of the gospel.

This 'original' Epistle thus carries with it, in Völter's judgment, all the marks of 'originality.'[1] How simple it is—how far from all speculative construction is its conception of the Person of Christ! Here there is no pre-existence, no thought of two natures in Christ. The starting-point is the man Jesus: upon Him a judgment of faith is passed which, without transgressing the bounds of moral-religious contemplation, is founded upon the impression which His life, His death, His resurrection had made, which leaves Him a place amongst mankind and yet assigns Him His deserved rank as the bearer and accomplisher of the divine plan of salvation, the turning-point in the world's history, the Christ, the Son of God. So, too, the doctrine with regard to the Holy Spirit in this 'original' letter is in Völter's opinion another proof of 'originality,' since it is so entirely removed from all systematic usage.[2]

Völter would account for the teaching of chapters v. and vi., which, with the exception of a few verses, are included in the original letter, by deriving it from a combination of Old Testament and Grecian ideas![3] But, in the first place, it is difficult to see how any passage in the Old Testament could so plainly lead to a judgment of God justifying all men by the sufferings of the righteous One, and the atoning efficacy

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 48. [2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.* p. 49.

of such sufferings. He proceeds to remark that the representation in chapter vi. of the mystical union of the Christian with Christ is an idea which had a home in the mystical religion of the Greeks, where the believer shares by consecration in the life of the gods, in their sufferings and resurrection ; but it is not easy to believe that any idea derived from the heathen mysteries, the sink of all impurity, would commend itself to the early Christians, amongst whom, on Völter's own showing, we must rank the historical Paul, the author of this part of the Epistle.

But Völter attaches special significance to the fact that there is no sign in this 'original' letter of the sharp antinomian attitude which characterises some portions of our Epistle to the Romans.[1] According to him, it is historically impossible that Paul should have adopted a position towards the law which regarded it as entirely cancelled, and yet that he should have maintained the relations with the primitive Apostles which are described in the Acts. If he held the views regarding the law which are ascribed to him in the interpolated portions of the Epistle to the Romans, then the difference between Paul and the Twelve would have been irreconcilable: to declare the law entirely cancelled for Gentile and Jewish Christians alike was quite a different thing from recognising its moral and lasting value, and from allowing it to stand, so far as it was ceremonial and ritual, for Jewish Christians, and even as a Jewish Christian to join in its observance. The author of the interpolated portions of the Epistle to the Romans occupies the former standpoint; the historical Paul apparently the latter. That even thus this historical Paul should be exposed to the hostility of the Judaizing zealots was very conceivable (Rom. xv. 31).

But if the Apostle was exposed, on Völter's own showing (since ch. xv. 14–32 is included in the 'original' letter) to the attacks of an extreme section, nothing can be more arbitrary than to lay down exactly what he must have said, or ought to have said, in the face of such opposition and with the apprehension of its consequences, and to regard all else as interpolated.

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 51 ff.

When, moreover, Völter speaks of the 'historical' Paul, we are compelled to ask, as in the case of Steck, from whence does he derive this historical personage? If from the Acts, as seems to be the case to a great extent, then we have another instance of the curious manner in which the most recent negative criticism eagerly appeals to a document which the older Tübingen school had ruled out of court.

Into this original letter Völter considers that a later writer has inserted ch. i. 18–iii. 20 and viii. 13–32 (and in the former section he regards ii. 14, 15 as another interpolation).[1] These sections, he maintains, are nothing else than a development of the statement of the original letter (i. 16), that the gospel is a power of God for everyone that believeth, for the Jew first, and also for the Greek, but their Christology is different, as also their teaching concerning redemption. Christ is here regarded as the pre-existent essential Son of God, and is therefore spoken of in viii. 32 as 'God's own Son.' His essential being is the divine Spirit (πνεῦμα); He has only taken this sinful flesh by God's command for the purpose of redemption, to judge sin in the flesh and to break its dominion. Here, Völter maintains, redemption is based, not only upon the death and resurrection of Christ (as in the 'original' letter), but upon His coming in the flesh, just as in the fourth Gospel, of which this passage may be regarded as the immediate introductory step.

It is a somewhat wearisome task to attempt to follow Völter step by step through the series of differences which he discovers between his 'original' letter and the additions introduced by the 'first interpolator,' and it will probably be sufficient to point out that he is inclined to attribute to the hand of this writer the short passage which he reckons as an interpolation in the introduction of the Epistle, viz. ch. i. verses 1[b]–4.[2] But could anything be more arbitrary than thus to exclude from the original letter a passage so important in its Christological bearing, and to do so upon the ground that it agrees essentially with the Christology of viii. 3, 4, 32, *i.e.* with the conceptions of the first interpolator?

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 56. [2] *Ibid.* p. 61.

But a further series of interpolations is discovered by Völter, thus making a third group, viz. ch. iii. 21–iv. 25, v. 13, 14, v. 20, vi. 14, 15, vii. 1–6, and ch. ix. and x.[1] The author of this third series has in view the whole Christendom composed of Gentile and Jewish believers, but he specially addresses himself to the Jewish Christians. His purpose is to show them that the service of the law and the difference between Jew and Gentile is cancelled, and that the fact that the Jew remained behind, while the Gentiles crowded to salvation, ought not to be made a matter of reproach to the Gentile Apostle Paul. Nor was such a fact in contradiction to the divine choice of Israel, but, as he proceeds to argue, it was rather based upon this, viz. that the people chosen by God is not Israel after the flesh, but the Israel whom God had selected of His own free and merciful choice out of Gentiles and a remnant of the Jews, while the majority of the Jewish nation belonged to the vessels of wrath, having brought their rejection upon themselves by their own fault, and having no cause to complain of arbitrariness on the part of God.

The author of these sections, according to Völter,[2] is more closely allied to the writer of the original letter, and he instances, in proof of this, his teaching concerning the work of Christ and justification, although even here differences in detail are to be found. Thus, *e.g.*, this second interpolator regards the death of Jesus as a representative and atoning death, but the obedience of Jesus plays no part in this consideration: in the original letter the source of faith is the impression which the death of Jesus makes as a manifest act of obedience on His part towards God, while the Resurrection of Jesus can only serve as a confirmation of the faith thus awakened: accordingly, whilst in the original letter the death of Jesus is the immediate object of faith, in the second interpolator the starting-point is the Resurrection. The Resurrection thus awakens faith, and is the first and proper object of justifying faith, for it is faith in the almighty power of God declaring itself in the Resurrection of Jesus which is reckoned for righteousness (just as Abraham's faith in God's

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 73 ff. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 77 ff.

almighty power was so reckoned), in so far as in consequence of this faith the death of Jesus gains its atoning significance for the believer. The death of Christ, therefore, is not conceived of by this first interpolator so much from the point of view of the love of God, but rather from that of the righteousness of God. The second interpolator appropriates from the original letter the thought of the believer dying with Jesus, but, again, with a characteristic turn of thought. According to the original letter, the actual body of sin is killed with the body of Christ, so that the believer is dead unto sin; according to the second interpolator, the believer, while his flesh is slain with the body of Christ, is become dead to the law, since the law is only appointed for the fleshly man, to awaken the sinful passions dormant in the flesh. We thus arrive at the important difference which exists, as Völter maintains, between the writer of the original letter and the second interpolator with regard to the law. The former reckons the law more from a Christian standpoint as the highest and best source for the knowledge of the divine will which the Christian has to fulfil: the second interpolator, on the contrary, recognises in the law only the purpose of stirring up the motions of sin in the flesh, of making sin to abound, and so of awakening the conscience to a sense of the divine wrath; thus it negatively prepares the true way of salvation, of which it also positively testifies, but after this true way of salvation has appeared, the law is cancelled for those who have entered upon it.

Völter's next step is an attempt to show that our second interpolator is considerably opposed to the first interpolator.[1] With regard to the work of Christ and justification, this opposition manifests itself just in proportion as our second interpolator is in agreement with the 'original' letter: with regard to the attitude towards the law, the difference which Völter claims to have established between the 'original' letter and the second interpolator manifests itself still more sharply between the first and second interpolator.[2] The former, *e.g.*, recognises in the law the expression of the divine will, according

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 79 ff. [2] *Ibid.* p. 99.

to which mankind and their works will be judged at the judgment. In his view, all depends upon this: that man whom the law, on account of the sinfulness of the flesh, can only aid to a knowledge of sin and not to justification, is armed by the redemption in Christ with a power which enables him to free himself from the power of the flesh and sin, and to fulfil the law. The second interpolator, on the contrary, conceives of the redeemed as dead to the flesh and to the law, and so the law in the case of the redeemed is cancelled.

In the course of his criticism upon this second interpolation, Völter thinks that ch. ix. and x., which are a part of it, enable us to form some idea of the date of its composition. But when he proceeds to place this after the catastrophe of A.D. 70 because in ch. ix. the author speaks of the majority of Israel as belonging to the vessels of wrath which God has appointed to destruction, we may fairly point, not only to the strong protest of Godet,[1] but also to the still more recent and remarkable one raised by R. Lipsius,[2] against any attempt to separate ch. ix.–xi. from the authorship of the rest of the Epistle. Lipsius shows us by a careful analysis how these three chapters (ix.–xi.) form a complete and natural section of Paul's argument, whilst Völter, not content with regarding ch. ix. and x. as one interpolation, asks us to consider ch. xi. as another, the work again of some later hand.

But Völter's ingenuity is by no means exhausted, and perhaps nowhere is it carried to a greater length than in his separation of ch. vii. 7–25 and viii. 2 from the rest of the Epistle: these verses, he asks us to believe, belong neither to the 'original' letter nor to the first or second interpolation: they are the work of another and a later hand seeking to bridge over the chasm which divides ch. vii. 1–6 from viii. 1, 3!

But without entering further into the arbitrary method adopted by Völter in dealing with the Epistle to the Romans —a method condemned by R. Lipsius no less than by Godet and Gloël—it is even more surprising to find that he applies

[1] Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, p. 644, 2nd edit. 1890.

[2] *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 70.

the same method to the Epistle to the Galatians. Here it is obvious that there is little ground to complain of the *length* of the Epistle, and yet in the half-dozen chapters which it contains Völter claims to have discovered a whole series of interpolations and instances of dependence upon the Epistle to the Romans! But even after these interpolations are marked out, that which remains is not the work of Paul, and Völter here agrees with Steck in regarding the whole Epistle as spurious.[1]

He rejects it, first of all, upon two grounds closely connected together—(1) its theology; (2) its relation to the other Pauline Epistles, especially the Romans. Many of the objections which Völter raises in this part of his attack have been already anticipated by Steck, and met fairly and successfully by Gloël, and again, still more recently, in a very concise form, by Lipsius. Völter's attack, however, is more complicated than that of Steck, owing to the manner in which he had previously broken up the Epistle to the Romans. Thus, he commences by pointing out that both Romans and Galatians have the same groundwork—the universality of sin; that in both Epistles the law is brought into a close relationship to sin; but he argues that, in some particulars of this relationship the author of Galatians borrows from the first interpolator of the Romans, whilst in other respects he follows the antinomian second interpolator. It is evident how entirely subjective such speculations must be.

But when Völter pretends to found an argument for the dependence of the Galatians upon the Romans from the passage in the former ch. iii. 21–iv. 25, we are reminded that the same line of argument had been previously adopted by Steck, and that the same answer may be given to it, viz. that there is nothing strange in the fact that a writer like Paul, himself an Israelite, should derive his teaching both here and in Rom. iv. from familiar incidents and characters of the Old Testament.

Völter, however, is not content with supposing a dependence of the Galatians upon one other Epistle; according to

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 89–105.

him, it also contains instances of dependence upon the two Epistles to the Corinthians. Some of these alleged instances of dependence have been already anticipated by Steck—*e.g.* Gal. iv. 12–20 in relation to 1 Cor. iv. 14, 15: Gal. v. 19–21 in relation to 1 Cor. vi. 9—and, it is not too much to add, have been already refuted by Gloël. Most, if not all, of them are easily accounted for, unless we are prepared to lay down a canon to the effect that a writer must never reproduce the same thoughts, or clothe them in somewhat similar words, even when he is addressing different hearers.

Let us now turn to Völter's examination of the historical notices in the Epistle to the Galatians.[1] Here he starts with an assumption, viz. that the first two chapters are meant to serve an apologetic purpose, and to support the proof that Paul's gospel was derived directly and exclusively from a divine revelation, that it had kept itself free from all human influence, and in the face of human assaults had asserted and proved its independence and its truth. He is careful to point out that this apologetic aim is not in itself any ground for regarding the notices contained in this part of the Epistle as unhistorical, but it is at once evident that the assumption with which he starts leads him to the most fanciful judgments.

Thus, *e.g.*, the expression in Gal. i. 15, in which Paul speaks of himself as '*separated* from his mother's womb' (*ἀφορίσας*), reminds Völter of the expression in Rom. i. 1, '*separated* unto the Gospel of God' (*ἀφωρισμένος*). But whilst in the latter case Paul only states in a general way that he was separated from human surroundings to preach the Gospel, in the latter the word 'separated' is strikingly determined by the addition 'from my mother's womb' (*ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός*). This addition to the expression 'separated' (*ἀφορίσας*) in Gal. i. 15 is to Völter's thinking quite senseless and gratuitous, unless it refers to some definite event at birth which could be regarded as a token that God had some special design with regard to the new-born child. He is therefore of opinion that the words in Gal. i. 15 'separated me from my mother's womb' (*ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός*) are to be explained

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 120 ff.

by a combination of the word 'separated' (ἀφωρισμένος) in Rom. i. 1, and of the words 'as to one born out of due time' (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι) in 1 Cor. xv. 8. This latter expression he believes that the author of the Galatian Epistle has taken literally; he thought that Paul here points himself out 'as one untimely born,' and he saw in this expression Paul's peculiar destiny already intimated. Thus, then, Völter would have us conclude that Gal. i. 15 presupposes Rom. i. 1 and 1 Cor. xv. 8; that it wrongly defines the first passage and gives a wrong explanation to the second, and that herein lies a proof that the author of the Galatian Epistle could not have been Paul himself!

But a further examination of Gal. i. arouses Völter's suspicions still more. In comparing Gal. i. 12, 15, 16 with the narratives of Paul's conversion in the Acts, and with 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8, he lays it down that in Galatians no reference is made to an external appearance, but only to an inward process in the Apostle's mind. He admits that one might be inclined to attach little weight to the difference between Galatians on the one hand and the Acts and 1 Corinthians on the other, and to combine the two descriptions, since at least in two passages of the Acts (xxii. 6–9 and xxvi. 13, 14) the voice must be conceived of as an inward process in Paul's mind, connected with the external appearance vouchsafed to him, and Paul in Gal. i. might easily be supposed to speak of this inward process alone, since it was for him the chief fact. But he proceeds to argue that this difference is seen on closer consideration to be connected with another and a weighty discrepancy between Galatians and the Acts. In the latter, all three narratives of Paul's conversion presuppose that Paul had already learnt, or was to learn, the details of the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of Christ indirectly or directly from those who were witnesses of them, and according to 1 Corinthians this was without doubt the case (comp. 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, xv. 3, xi. 23). The Epistle to the Galatians, on the contrary, derives from the event before Damascus, not merely the conversion of Paul and his call to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, but also his

whole preparation for that office. Paul's whole gospel has its source in that event before Damascus, so that he assures us that nothing had been received from men, nor taught him by man (Gal. i. 11, 12), and so the event is represented as a revelation of Jesus Christ—as a revelation of His Son which God had wrought in Paul, with an imitation which can scarcely be mistaken of Matt. xvi. 17 in Gal. i. 16. In Völter's opinion it is simply impossible to suppose that Paul's gospel was thus received, apart from all human communication and instruction. That gospel has an historical foundation: historical events, the life and teaching, death and resurrection of an historical Person form its contents, and the Apostle could only have gained his knowledge from men to whom these events were known. If the author of the Galatian Epistle contradicts this, then we can only see in such a contradiction a proof that we are dealing with a writer who in the pursuit of his tendency entirely loses sight of the limits between what is possible and what is impossible, the historical and the unhistorical. But if this is so, Völter holds that he is justified in regarding the incidents which the author of the Galatians associates with Paul's conversion as also devoid of all historical credibility. The narratives of the Acts which represent the Apostle as entering into fellowship with the Christians at Damascus, and with the Apostles at Jerusalem (ix. 8 ff., xxii. 10 ff.) are far more simple and natural, far less exposed to the suspicion of tendency, and far more probable, than the account in Gal. i. 16 ff., according to which Paul confers not with flesh and blood, but immediately leaves Damascus for the deserts of Arabia. In this narrative the author of the Epistle, in Völter's view, wished to enter his protest against the immediate intercourse of Paul after his conversion with the Christians at Damascus, especially with Ananias, and this protest he would endorse by making Paul undertake a journey to Arabia, where, withdrawn from all human influences, he could meditate upon the revelation which he had received, and prepare his gospel. Just as Peter after his confession of Christ as the Son of God was deemed worthy by Jesus of the acknowledgment that flesh and blood had not revealed it unto him,

so, thinks Völter, it was necessary for the author of the Galatians to represent Paul as deriving his knowledge of Jesus Christ through divine revelation alone, in which flesh and blood shared just as little as in the case of Peter. The same tendency of the writer to assert the divine origin of Paul's gospel is further witnessed in the notice that Paul's visit to the primitive Apostles at Jerusalem does not take place after a short stay in Damascus, but only after his sojourn in Arabia, and after a three years' interval from the date of his conversion (Gal. i. 18).[1] At the same time it is evident, according to Völter, that the account in the Galatian Epistle presupposes some such representation of Paul's conversion as in the Acts to be known to the author, since, although he omits to tell us where the revelation of which he speaks took place, he shows through the words 'I returned again to Damascus' (*πάλιν ὑπέστρεψα εἰς Δαμασκόν*), that he looks upon the neighbourhood of Damascus as the acknowledged scene of that revelation (Gal. i. 17).

It is this same tendency to represent Paul's gospel as independent from the first, which Völter discovers in the account given in Gal. i. of the Apostle's first visit to Jerusalem. According to Gal. i. 18, 19, Paul sees only Peter and James when he goes up to Jerusalem, and Völter at once jumps to the conclusion that such a statement is entirely at variance with Acts ix. 26, 27, where Paul essays to join himself to the disciples at Jerusalem, but they are all afraid until Barnabas takes him and brings him unto the Apostles. But if, argues Völter, Paul had open intercourse with the whole Church at Jerusalem, as we gather from Acts ix. 26–9, those explanations must at once have been entered into with regard to the teaching of the Pauline gospel, which the author of the Galatian Epistle reserves for the Apostolic Council. The first visit of Paul to Jerusalem is therefore, according to the Galatians, resolved into a purely personal meeting between the Apostle and Peter and James, while the additional effect

[1] On the alleged discrepancies of time between Gal. i. 18 and Acts ix. 20–26, see Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 89; Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, p. 40.

is produced that, at this his first visit to Jerusalem, Paul stands by the side of the two leaders of the primitive Church as their equal.

Again, therefore, Völter would have us accept the narrative in the Acts as the more trustworthy, inasmuch as it contrasts so favourably with the Galatians in its freedom from tendency: and again we are struck with the readiness with which Völter, like Steck before him, accepts the trustworthiness of a book which Baur and his followers rejected in favour of the (to them) undoubted historical document, the Epistle to the Galatians.

Many of the objections raised by Völter against the historic character of the Galatians are exactly similar to those raised by Steck, and the same answers are equally valid. It is, however, important to bear in mind that here again, not only Gloël, but Lindemann[1] and Lipsius see no reason to doubt the historical accuracy of the notice in Galatians i. 18 of Paul's sojourn in Jerusalem for fifteen days with Peter.

With regard to some of the points of detail upon which Völter lays stress in his attack upon this notice, it may be safely asserted that no contradiction can be proved between Acts ix. 27 ff. and Gal. i. 18, 19,[2] since the other Apostles, with the exception of Peter and James, might either have been absent from Jerusalem at the time, or Paul might not have attended any public meeting of the Church. Nor, again, does it seem very reasonable to suppose that, even if Paul's visit to Peter and James was a purely private and personal one, no explanations of his peculiar 'gospel' could have been included in the intercourse of fifteen days, especially if Paul was from the very first so anxious to assert the independence of his teaching.

After all this, it is not surprising to find that the famous passage Gal. ii. 1–10 affords Völter still further scope for

[1] Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, pp. 40, 41; Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 16.

[2] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 91, 92; Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 206; Plumptre (Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.*) ii. 62; and see also Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, as to this, and the supposed 'tendency' of the Acts p. 564, 2. Aufl. 1889.

extravagant ingenuity and arbitrary criticism. It seems impossible for him to approach any book of the New Testament without applying to it the same method of disintegration which he applied to the Apocalypse. Thus he is not content with a comparison of Gal. ii. and Acts xv. unless the latter chapter is broken up into sections: Acts xv. 5–21 does not belong to the original source, but to a later addition, and therefore we must compare Gal. ii. 1–10, not only with this portion of the chapter, but also with Acts xv. 1–4 and 22–33. In addition to a comparison with these two portions of Acts xv., Völter also requires us to compare Gal. ii. 1–10 with Acts xi. 27–30. In this latter passage mention is made of a second visit of Paul accompanied by Barnabas to Jerusalem, for the purpose of bringing charitable alms to the saints in that city, and in Acts xv. we have a third visit of Paul, again accompanied by Barnabas, to the Jewish capital. But Völter asks us to regard these two visits mentioned in Acts xi. and xv. as one and the same: they are, he maintains, two different accounts of the same journey, which the author had obtained from different sources, and which, owing to their distinctive details, he had referred to two journeys instead of to one.[1]

But when he compares these two accounts with Gal. ii. 1–10, although he acknowledges some points of agreement, he soon discovers the old 'tendency' at work in the narrative of the Galatian Epistle. In Gal. ii. 2 Paul goes up to Jerusalem 'by revelation' (*κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν*), but of this, says Völter, neither Acts xi. 27–30 nor xv. 1–4, 22–33 know anything.[2] Here, then, we again encounter the purpose of the

[1] On the visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem and the notices in Acts and Galatians, see Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, pp. 30–33 (Introd.); Lightfoot, *Galatians*, pp. 91, 92, 110, 123 ff.; Nösgen, *Apostelgeschichte*, p. 236; Weiss, *ubi supra*, p. 564, note.

[2] See, however, on the expression *κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν* Lightfoot's note, *Galatians*, p. 125, where he points out that there is no contradiction between this statement and the fact that in the Acts Paul is represented as sent to Jerusalem by the Christians at Antioch: 'The historian naturally records the external impulse which led to the mission; the Apostle himself states his inward motive. . . . The very stress which he lays on this resolution seems to show that other circumstances were at work.'

author of the Galatian Epistle to assert the entire freedom of the Apostle from any dependence upon man, and this purpose becomes still more evident when we consider that the motive of the journey given in Gal. ii. 4 makes the introduction of the κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν of verse 2 quite unnecessary. Even if it be contended that Gal. ii. 4 shows that the author of the Galatian Epistle was acquainted with the same motive of the journey as that mentioned in the Acts, yet this, argues Völter, is nothing in its favour, and indeed it rather awakens a suspicion against the Pauline authorship of the Epistle, since the brief intimation of Gal. ii. 4 appears to presuppose the more exact and complete narrative of the Acts! A narrative such as we find in Acts xv. 1–4 simply gives the occasion of the journey, without having recourse to any revelation as the motive, and makes upon us the impression of unvarnished historical truth!

The same preference for the narrative of the Acts shows itself when Völter compares the compact arrived at between Paul and the Pillar Apostles in Gal. ii. 1–10 with the results of the Apostolic Council in Acts xv. In his view Acts xv. 1–4, 22–33 gives us a record clear, free from contradictions, raised above any suspicion of a tendency, and containing all the elements of historical probability. But all this praise, we must remember, is again bestowed at the expense of Gal. ii. 1–10, in which we are asked to believe that the historical elements are either relegated to the background, or are disfigured and displaced, by the additions and perversions of a writer whose object is always to exalt Paul and his gospel.

But not only have conservative critics like Lechler[1] and Godet, and scientific critics like B. Weiss and Reuss,[2] refused to regard the alleged differences between Acts xv. and Gal. ii. as irreconcilable, but more recently still, we find Lipsius not only admitting that the narrative in Gal. ii. 1–10 refers to the same event as Acts xv., but defending its historic truth against

[1] Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 163–209.

[2] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 132, 133, 2. Aufl.; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, i. 49 (Introd.); Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 60, 63, 6. Aufl. 1887.

Steck.[1] He sees no difficulty in the division of missionary work (not in a geographical, but in an ethnographical sense) between Paul and the Pillar Apostles, such as is described in Gal. ii., a division which does not destroy the recognition of a brotherly relation of fellowship, and he regards the conduct of the Apostles as a bright example of that genuine sentiment of union which in the living consciousness of a common foundation of Christian belief stretches out a brotherly hand even across deeply-felt theological oppositions. That this division of labour was soon found to be impracticable in Churches composed of Jews and Gentiles is not, Lipsius maintains, any argument for rejecting the historical character of this representation: the compact at Jerusalem, he adds, was of course soon superseded by the sequence of events.

Völter commences by remarking[2] that what chiefly differentiates Acts xv. 5–21 is the fact that here a separate assembly of the Apostles and elders is presupposed, which Pharisaically-minded Christians who had arisen in the Church assembly at Jerusalem had occasioned by demanding that Gentile Christians should be circumcised and obey the law. This interpolation of verses 5–21 was prompted, Völter asks us to believe, by the Epistle to the Galatians. The expression in Gal. ii. 2, 'but privately to those of reputation' (*κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν*), would easily be understood as if Paul was speaking of a separate negotiation with the Apostles, which took place close upon the assembly of the Church, and since the Galatian Epistle first mentions 'false brethren brought in unawares' (*παρείσακτοι ψευδάδελφοι*) on the occasion of the negotiations at Jerusalem, while previously it had only spoken of the revelation (verse 2) as the motive of Paul's journey, it was easy to understand Gal. ii. 4 as if Paul there spoke of false brethren who had arisen in the Church assembly at Jerusalem. Völter therefore believes that the author, or the reviser, of the Acts had the Epistle to the Galatians before him, and from an entire misunder-

[1] Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 22, 1891.
[2] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 148.

standing of Gal. ii. 1–10, particularly of verses 2 and 4, has supplemented Acts xv. 1–4, 22–33 by the verses 5–21. If he speaks of some of the sect of the Pharisees who believed (verse 5), this for the author of the third Gospel is an obvious explanation of the phrase in Gal. ii. 4, 'false brethren brought in unawares.' Could any exegesis, we may well ask, be more extravagant or arbitrary than this?

Another instance of Völter's arbitrary criticism meets us in the manner in which he compares the remaining part of Gal. ii. with the Acts.[1] He commences by refusing to recognise the historical character of Paul's words in Gal. ii. 11–21, because the Apostle adopts an attitude towards the law which must be regarded as unhistorical when we compare it with the account of the Apostolic Council in the Acts—an attitude which is inconsistent with the 'original' Epistle to the Romans, and due to the influence of the 'first' and 'second' 'revisers' of that Epistle. It is difficult to see how a critic can form a fair judgment as to the historical nature of a narrative when he approaches it with such presuppositions. But Völter's mode of dealing with the information in Gal. ii. and the Acts as to the conflict at Antioch between Peter and Paul is even more surprising. The Acts, as he remarks, relates nothing directly of the coming of Peter to Antioch, and of the quarrel with Paul: but may it not say something of this incident indirectly? Let us only read, says Völter, Acts x. 1–11, 18. If we do so, and contrast this passage with Gal. ii. 11 ff., do we not receive the impression that Acts x. 1–11, 18, is a *pendant* to Gal. ii. 11 ff.—a *pendant* in which, in contrast with Gal. ii. 11, Peter is to be represented as he who first broke through, upon an undoubtedly divine incitement, the barrier between circumcised and uncircumcised, not merely with regard to community of belief, but also in regard to fellowship at table? But in this case Völter considers it beyond a doubt that the 'tendency' is on the side of the Acts:[2] the passage (Acts x. 1–11, 18) must be regarded as unhistorical, for if we accept it, the passage in xv. 1–4, 22–33, becomes quite unintelligible, since there

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 149 ff. [2] *Ibid.* p. 150.

we find that the question of the position of Gentiles with reference to the law must first be brought before the primitive Church, and the freedom of Gentile Christians from circumcision must be first acknowledged by it. But the difficulty is easily explained by Völter, for we have only to suppose that the author of the Acts added the section xv. 5–21 to the rest of the narrative in the chapter, and thus made a meagre attempt to bring ch. xv. into relation with ch. x. 1–11, 18, and to balance them one with the other.

But Völter believes it possible to show that the author of the Acts was acquainted with a narrative similar to that of the Galatian Epistle, but had passed it over.[1] We have seen, he says, that the narrative in Acts xv. 1–4, 22–33, ought to be placed before ch. xiii. and xiv., and runs parallel with Acts xi. 27–30. At the conclusion of the section Acts xv. 1–4, 22–33, it is related that Judas and Silas again returned to Jerusalem from Antioch, but in Acts xv. 35 ff. the presence of Silas at Antioch is presupposed without anything being told us of his coming thither: so, too, with regard to John Mark, his presence at Antioch is also presupposed without any notice being given of his coming thither. Now if, argues Völter, it had only been a question of the return of Silas and Mark to Antioch, the author of the Acts would probably have spoken of it: that he passes it over in silence can only be accounted for on some pressing ground, and the reason, in Völter's opinion, is to be found in the belief that Silas and Mark returned to Antioch in company with Peter; but the author of the Acts probably omits to mention this arrival of Peter with Silas and Mark at Antioch, because it was connected with the conflict which took place in that city between Peter and Paul.

In one of his most characteristic and ingenious arguments, Völter would prove to us that this is no mere baseless conjecture. He takes the narrative related in Acts xii. This narrative is placed after the narrative in Acts xi. 27–30, with which Acts xv. 1–4, 22–33 is, as Völter has already maintained, parallel. After the incidents recorded in Acts xii.

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 151.

1–23, we certainly find verses 24 and 25, which belong to Acts xi. 27–30. But, says Völter, these verses 24 and 25 are evidently only placed after xii. 1–23, in order to be able to join to them the narrative in xiii. 1, and thus to bring them into connection with Acts xi. 19–30. And so the narrative in Acts xii. 1–23 really belongs, according to the author of the Acts, after the incident of the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 27–30 and xii. 24, 25). But in Acts xii. 1–23 we find the notice that Peter was obliged to leave Jerusalem and betake himself 'to another place' (verse 17). Therefore the Acts thus fix a departure of Peter from Jerusalem subsequent to the Apostolic Council (since, according to Völter, Acts xi. 27–30 and Acts xv. refer to the same visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem), and we are at liberty to suppose that by the expression 'to another place,' allusion is made to Antioch. After elaborating an argument of this very subjective kind, Völter expresses his conviction that the Acts sufficiently indicate the substantial correctness of the narrative in Gal. ii. 11 ff., at any rate so far as the coming of Peter to Antioch, his conflict with Paul and the occasion of it, are concerned.[1] In his view the position of things at Antioch was somewhat as follows:—Paul and Barnabas and the other Jewish Christians at Antioch partook with the Gentile Christians of the love-feasts, at which regard was had to the Jewish scruples as to food, although not in the ordinary fellowship at table. Peter acts similarly when he comes to Antioch. But when emissaries arrived from James, Peter and the other Jewish Christians, and even Barnabas, withdrew from the common meals: Paul alone remained firm, and we may assume, thinks Völter, that Paul regarded Peter's conduct and that of the other Jewish Christians as a disgraceful and cowardly yielding against their own better conviction, at which he was the more indignant, since the question for the Jewish Christians was one of a small formal concession, but of great importance for the fellowship in Christian belief.

To this effect Völter is willing to admit that Paul expressed himself. But that the Apostle could have adopted

[1] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 152.

the position towards the Jewish law which the Epistle to the Galatians represents, and that he could have used the words which that Epistle places in his mouth— this Völter considers an impossibility, and he cannot accept it as historical ; the point of view of the author of the Galatians, in common with that of his favourite 'second reviser' of the Epistle to the Romans, whom Völter again introduces, is that of an advanced Paulinism, and of a Gentile Christianity which had entirely freed itself from any connection with, or any regard for, a Jewish Christianity.

In the pages which follow, Völter renews the attacks, with which Steck has already made us familiar, upon the character of the Galatian Epistle, and upon its alleged want of harmony with historical conditions. But after Gloël's admirable defence of the living and powerful personality which speaks to us in the pages of Galatians,[1] it is needless to follow Völter in his description of it as an abstract document, which contains but a slight reminiscence of actual experiences. Völter makes a great deal of the question as to whom the Epistle was addressed, whether to the inhabitants of the district called Galatia, or to the inhabitants of the Roman province of Galatia.[2] But here again it will be noticed that Lipsius, with all the difficulties before him relating to this point, unhesitatingly declines to accept them, even if unsolved, as any argument against the genuineness of the Epistle.[3]

Völter finally elaborates an argument to show that Galatians points to a later time than 2 Corinthians, and therefore to a later period than the Apostolic age.[4] At first sight we might, he thinks, be tempted to suppose that in Galatians reference is made to the Jewish emissaries with whom one undoubtedly has to deal in 2 Corinthians. But this, in Völter's view, is by no means the case. The notice in Gal. vi. 13, 14, in which the agitators are more closely characterised, points, according to him, to what he calls a

[1] Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 90–93.
[2] Völter, *ubi supra*, p. 154.
[3] Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 8, 1891.
[4] Völter, *ubi supra*, pp. 167 ff.

spontaneous Judaising movement within the Churches. At a time, when a Christian as such was an object of enmity, circumcision, so offensive at other times, appeared to many a specious means of preservation against persecution : Christians of repute who had public interests received circumcision, without accepting the whole Jewish law, in order to secure their social position ; naturally, they strenuously endeavoured to persuade their fellow-citizens to a similar course, so that they might represent the whole Church to their Jewish persecutors (for of such we have probably to take account in the first instance) as a Church of the circumcised, distinct from the mother Christian Church, and as such possessing a claim to toleration. But this, Völter adds, is quite another kind of movement from that with which we have to deal in Corinth, and points plainly to a later period than the Apostolic age. To counteract this movement Völter supposes that the author of the Galatians (who was some later Pauline) clothed his Epistle with the authority and name of Paul. But the Paul, whom this unknown Pauline presents to us, has lost all the features of the historical Paul of the Acts, all Paul's just regard for the Jews and Jewish Christians ; the picture is drawn after the model of the sharp antinomian Paul which 'the second reviser' of the Epistle to the Romans had rendered familiar : and whilst this unknown author represents the relations of the Apostle with the Galatians after the fashion of 1 and 2 Corinthians, he impresses upon the Judaising agitators the type of the Judaists of his own day.

Here we find ourselves again face to face with some of the most characteristic of Völter's criticism : 'the historical Paul of the Acts' as contrasted with the Paul of the Epistles ; 'the second interpolator' of the Epistle to the Romans, a needless personage in the eyes of advanced critics like Lipsius, who consider that the difference of tone between the Roman and Galatian Epistles is amply accounted for by the position of things in the two different Churches addressed ; [1] a fanciful picture of the historical conditions at the time of the Galatian Epistle—conditions which, as Gloël has shown so

[1] *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 8.

fully (a proof warmly endorsed by Hilgenfeld), are in entire accordance with the received date of composition, and with no other.[1]

But not only has Völter's attempt thus to break up and invalidate the two Epistles, Romans and Galatians, been classed by Lipsius under the head of merely subjective and conjectural criticism,[2] but it has called forth the extreme regret of Hilgenfeld,[3] who, after remarking that Steck's attack on the Galatians would only afford joy to the opponents of all critical inquiry into primitive Christianity, adds that this 'critical influenza' has extended still further, and embraced amongst others Daniel Völter, and W. C. van Manen, the last-named clearly showing whither 'this critical epidemic' leads, since he regards Steck as *too conservative* in retaining his belief in Paul as a great historical reality. Attention has before been drawn to Hilgenfeld's firm rejection of the Steck and Völter hypothesis, and this fact is in itself sufficient to prove that the present foremost representative of the Tübingen school is little inclined to change his attitude with regard to the authenticity of the *Hauptbriefe*; and in this decided protest against Steck and his followers he by no means stands alone, since he is joined by numerous other advanced critics—*e.g.* C. Holsten, Lindemann, and Volkmar.[4]

When Gloël wrote his answer to Steck, Hilgenfeld had not yet expressed an opinion upon the newest phase of New Testament criticism, but in a note Gloël quotes with pleasure the fulfilment of his expectations in Hilgenfeld's disavowal of Steck's hypothesis.[5] In his criticism of Steck and Völter, contained in his review of Gloël and Lindemann,

[1] Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie*, p. 361, 1890.

[2] Lipsius, *ubi supra*, pp. 9 and 75. So, too, Weiss, 'Der Römerbrief,' p. 33 in Meyer's *Commentar*, 1891. [3] Hilgenfeld, *ubi supra*, p. 358.

[4] It is only fair to note that Lipsius (*ubi supra*, p. 9), although by no means endorsing his opinions, recognises the earnestness of Steck's work, and the fact that he has called attention to many unsolved difficulties. Harnack, while admitting that the strength of such attacks as those of Loman lies in the difficulties which surround the early history of the Church, declares that the rejection of such a primary source as 1 Corinthians presents to him an insuperable argument against these new hypotheses (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. p. 49, 2. Aufl.).

[5] Gloël, *ubi supra*, p. 14.

Hilgenfeld expresses his entire agreement, not only with Gloël's defence of the received date of the *Hauptbriefe*, but also with other details in his argument. Thus he considers that Gloël has conclusively shown that the Galatian Epistle is not dependent on the Romans or 1 and 2 Corinthians; he agrees with him also in the view that a dependence of Paul upon Philo and Seneca is quite unprovable, and he approves of his rejection of Steck's attempt to set aside or weaken the attestation to the Pauline Epistles contained in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the oldest Fathers of the Church.[1]

There is, moreover, another point of view from which this criticism by Hilgenfeld becomes full of fresh interest and importance. It is evident that if, as Hilgenfeld admits, the dependence of the *Hauptbriefe* upon Philo and Seneca cannot be proved, a further blow has been struck at Steck's theory, and at what Godet calls 'la clef de voûte du système.'[2]

According to Steck, when the news of the appearance of Jesus reached Rome it produced there two different Christianities, the one Judaic preached by the Apostles and Paul, the other Hellenic, the product of the Grecian colony established at Rome. Up to the close of the first century these two tendencies—the Judaic and the Hellenic—ran in parallel lines; but a part of the Roman Hellenists rebelled against any attempt at fusion, and embodied their protest in the four great Epistles bearing the name of Paul, 120–140 A.D. These Epistles, therefore, were not in reality the work of the historical Paul, but of the extreme Greek-spiritualistic school which existed within the Christian Church at Rome.

But not only is it impossible to prove the least dependence upon the teaching of Philo or Seneca in these four Epistles, but we may proceed further and advance a positive argument to the effect that the three chief notions which dominate the Epistle to the Romans are essentially

[1] Hilgenfeld, *ubi supra*.

With these remarks we may comp. those of Lipsius and Schmiedel in condemnation of Steck.

See *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, pp. 8, 9, and ii. erste Abtheilung, i. Hälfte, pp. 34 ff. (Introd. to 1 and 2 Cor.).

[2] Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 642, 2nd edit. 1890.

Judaic. This has been admirably worked out by Godet in his criticism of Steck's theory.[1]

There are, Godet reminds us, three ideas which dominate the teaching of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, the very Epistle upon which Steck would rely as affording the best support to the theory of what he terms an Hellenico-Roman origin of the *Hauptbriefe*. These three ideas are justification by faith, sanctification by the Holy Spirit, and the relation between Jew and Gentile in a common salvation. The first of these ideas is essentially Judaic. If Hellenism possesses up to a certain point the notions of sin, of expiation, of absolution, the idea of a positive imputation of justice accorded to faith on the part of God is absolutely strange to it, since we must presuppose the idea of a holy and merciful God, which belongs to the revelation vouchsafed to Israel. We can trace the idea from Genesis (xv. 3) through the Psalmists and Prophets, and we can see how familiar it had become to the Jewish mind in the books of the Maccabees (Ps. cxliii. 2; Isaiah l. 8; 1 Macc. ii. 52, 61). And if this is so, we can also readily understand how this fundamental notion of Paulinism emanates purely and simply from the circle of Old Testament ideas, and not from that of any Græco-Roman school.

So, too, the same argument may be applied to the second essential notion of Paulinism—the sanctifying work of the divine Spirit in the heart of the justified believer. The more closely this idea is shown to be related to the Old Testament (comp., *e.g.*, Ps. li. 12–14; Jer. xxxi. 33, 34; Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27) the further is it removed from Greek philosophy, and especially from that form of it which prevailed in Rome amongst the best thinkers of the second century—that of Stoicism. Without entirely disavowing the need of communion with God, Stoicism made human nature rely upon its own self-sufficiency, and believed man capable of realising for himself the moral ideal; whilst the Pauline teaching was

[1] Lipsius (*ubi supra*) expresses himself as entirely opposed to the theory of Steck that the Pauline Epistles bear a thorough Hellenistic character without any acquaintance with Old Testament views.

based upon two facts—the powerlessness of man for good, and the necessity for a work of God Himself in the heart of the believer.

With regard to the third idea—viz. that of the relation between Jew and Gentile in the possession of the salvation offered by the gospel—if such a question had ever presented itself to the Greek mind, it would not in any case have excited the poignant interest with which Paul treats of it in Rom. ix.–xi.; one feels that it stirs his Jewish patriotism to the very depths of his heart. To attribute such accents of personal emotion and of such unequalled pathos to a Græco-Roman school of the second century is to offend against common sense, and is like trying to make water leap forth from a rock, as Moses did.[1]

We have thus dwelt at length upon the recent criticism directed against the *Hauptbriefe*, not only because it is unfair altogether to ignore it, but because to examine it in detail, and not merely to mention its existence, is one of the best and surest ways to justify the appeal which is made to these epistles in the following chapters. When all is said for this criticism which can be said, and when we have fully recognised with Lipsius the earnestness of Steck's endeavour, it is scarcely likely to obtain a following in face of the counter-criticism of writers like Scholten in Holland, of the most advanced representatives of French and German thought,[2] and, we may add, of the extreme negative criticism in England. What value a learned writer like B. Weiss attaches to these attacks may best be learnt from the fact that in the eighth edition of 'Meyer's Commentary on the Epistles to the Romans,' he dismisses Steck in the Introduction with a brief remark in a bracket,[3] and from the short and summary

[1] Compare with Godet's remarks those of Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 77 and 78 and note.

[2] See chaps. i. and iii. above.

[3] P. 33. Amongst still more recent writers, Mr. Gore speaks of the utterly perverse and untenable arguments of Loman and Steck (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 258), whilst in Germany Nösgen has remarked upon the extreme arbitrariness of such attacks as those of Steck upon the *Hauptbriefe* (*Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 20, 1891).

manner in which he deals with the interpolation theory of Weisse it is easy to see how he would regard the very similar theory maintained by Völter, of whom he makes no mention whatever. The description which Weizsäcker gives of the two Epistles to the Corinthians may not unfairly be extended to the four great Epistles of St. Paul:[1] they are, he says, in an eminent sense historical, they deal with a whole series of facts and circumstances in such a way as to compensate for an historical description; for many things they are the only, and for others at any rate the best, source; and if we possessed nothing else than these Epistles, they would be sufficient to afford us a representation of the oldest form in which the Christian religion developed itself on Græco-Roman ground.

[1] *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 265. Compare the remarks of Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.*, pp. 98, 192, 193, 230, 2. Aufl. 1886. In the face of many recent objections Baur's own remarks may well be recalled (*Paulus*, i. 276): 'Gegen diese vier Briefe ist nicht nur nie auch nur der geringste Verdacht der Unächtheit erhoben worden, sondern sie tragen auch den Charakter paulinischer Originalität so unwidersprechlich an sich, dass sich gar nicht denken lässt, welches Recht je der kritische Zweifel gegen sie geltend machen könnte.'

CHAPTER IV

ST. PAUL'S CHRISTOLOGY AND THE INCARNATION

In the previous chapter an endeavour has been made to show that no recent criticism deprives us of the right to appeal to the *Hauptbriefe* as the genuine writings of St. Paul. We can now proceed to examine the testimony of these Epistles to the great facts of the Gospels, as these facts are embodied for us in the Apostles' Creed and to the life and teaching of Jesus. References will also be made from time to time to the testimony of other Pauline writings, but chiefly to those which the most advanced critics accept as the genuine work of the Apostle (see above Chapter I.). What, then, may we gather from the Pauline Epistles as to the great fact of the Incarnation? We cannot dismiss the treatment of such a subject as one of a series of 'secondary questions,' as if it was not essentially bound up with a right understanding of Paul's conception of the Person and work of Christ.[1]

Although no doubt it is possible to build too much upon what has been so well called 'The Pauline Gospel of the Infancy' (Gal. iv. 4: 'God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law'), yet we may fairly say that St. Paul here mentions the birth of Jesus Christ in a way

[1] Even this is classed by Baur amongst the *Nebenfragen* (*Paulus*, ii. 262 ff.). After speaking of Baur's exposition of Paulinism, Sabatier adds: 'On peut cependant et l'on doit lui reprocher d'avoir méconnu et négligé les principes métaphysiques du paulinisme. Il les a rapidement touchés dans un court chapitre intitulé: *Questions Secondaires* (*Nebenfragen*). Or, est-il permis d'appeler ici choses secondaires les notions pauliniennes de Dieu, de la personne du Christ, de la prédestination, de la révélation? Ne sont-ce pas là au contraire autant de clefs de voûte essentielles, qui maintiennent l'harmonie et la solidité de la construction entière. Si l'exposition d'Usteri nous a paru sans base nous pouvons dire que celle de Baur reste sans couronnement' (Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 252).

which at least suggests an acquaintance with the opening chapters of St. Luke's Gospel.[1] The phrase 'made under the law' certainly carries with it such facts as these: that the child Jesus was circumcised on the eighth day;[2] that after forty days He was 'presented' in the Temple; that at the age of twelve He became more directly responsible for His obedience to the law, as was the custom with Jewish children; that at that age, or shortly after, personal attendance on the feasts at Jerusalem was required of Him;[3] it

[1] See Dean Plumptre's Introduction in Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.*, i. 30; and comp. chap. ii. p. 89, above, on Pfleiderer and Volkmar's treatment of the phrase, as a proof of how much it carried with it.

We may also compare Steinmeyer, *Geschichte der Geburt des Herrn*, p. 128 (1873), written of course from a different point of view; in speaking of Luke he writes: 'Was er von der Beschneidung des Knaben, von seiner Darstellung im Tempel und von der Darbringung der gesetzlichen Opfer erzählt; das erinnert zu lebhaft an das paulinische γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικὸς, γενόμενος ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ (Gal. iv. 4, 5), als dass wir in diesen Berichten tonlose Notizen erkennen könnten.'

The Greek word, moreover, which is used in Gal. iv. 4, must not be forgotten—ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ: the expression means, 'He sent forth from Himself' (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, *in loco*, p. 168), the word thus assuming the pre-existence of the Son, although, as Bishop Lightfoot adds, it must not be pressed to imply also the unity with the Father, as the same word is commonly used in later Greek in speaking of any mission. Comp. Lechler, *ubi supra*, pp. 315, 316. (For an appreciative notice of Lechler, to whom frequent reference will be made, see E. T. of Lichtenberger's *History of German Theology*, esp. p. 415.)

Amongst recent German Commentaries, we may also comp. the *Kurzgefasster Commentar zum N. T.* (Strack and Zöckler), iii. 72, 1887, and to the same effect Lipsius in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 42, 1891, where, although denying that Gal. iv. 4 points to a birth without a human father, he remarks: 'ἐξαπέστειλε sandte von sich aus (nämlich, in die Welt), setzt die Präexistenz des Sohnes voraus.'

B. Weiss, while accepting the passage as affirming Christ's pre-existence, remarks of the compound ἐξαπέστειλεν: 'das doch nur künstlich auf ein Sichtrennen des Vaters vom Sohne bezogen wird' (*Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 295, 5. Aufl. 1888).

[2] Schenkel, *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, p. 285, on Col. ii. 11, 'putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by *the circumcision of Christ*;' Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 14, on Gal. iv. 4. So, too, Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 123, 1891. Comp. Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 181; and Row's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 316, 333, 339; so, too, *Kurzgefasster Commentar* (Strack and Zöckler) *zum N. T.* ii. dritte Abtheilung, p. 72, 1887.

[3] 'In strict law personal observance of the ordinances, and hence attendance on the feasts at Jerusalem, devolved on a youth only when he was of age—that is, at thirteen years. Then he became what was called "a son of the Commandment," or "of the Torah." But, as a matter of fact, the legal age was in this respect

even suggests the probability that the Messiah waited till His thirtieth year before entering on His earthly ministry, for we know that to have been the age at which the Levites assumed their official duties.[1]

But can we say that the words 'God sent forth his Son, made of a woman' imply that St. Paul was acquainted with St. Luke's account of the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus? The expression 'made of a woman' is sufficiently striking to have caused even Hilgenfeld to note that it is in excellent accordance with the generation of Jesus without a human father, without expressly attesting the fact.[2] But one of the most remarkable testimonies to the force of the expression comes to us from Steck's review of St. Paul's Christology, although it may of course be said that Steck is only arguing to support his own theory of the late date and advanced Christology of the Pauline Epistles, and that it is therefore to his interest to magnify a simple expression beyond its ordinary meaning. After pointing out that Paul nowhere expressly states whether Jesus was conceived by the aid of a human father, or by the Holy Ghost, he mentions two passages which may be referred to in this connection, but from which, he adds, we arrive at no certain result.[3] The one is

anticipated by two years, or at least by one. It was in accordance with this custom that, on the first Pascha after Jesus had passed His twelfth year, His parents took Him with them in the "company" to Jerusalem. The common statement that Jesus went to the Temple because He was 'a son of the Commandment' is obviously erroneous. All the more remarkable, on the other hand, is St. Luke's accurate knowledge of Jewish customs, and all the more antithetic to the mythical theory the circumstance that he places this remarkable event in the twelfth year of Jesus' life, and not when he became "a Son of the Law"' (Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, i. 235, 236).

See also the remarks of Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter J. C.* ii. 355, on Luke ii. 42.

[1] Matheson's 'Historical Christ of St. Paul,' *Expositor*, 2nd series, vol. ii. p. 296. See, however, Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. i. 468, 470, who thinks that *not even* Gal. iv. 4, gives a firm basis of inference for the age of Jesus.

[2] 'Mit der Geburt aus dem Mutterschooss eines Weibes will der Apostel die wahre und vollkommene Menschheit Jesu als eine Selbstverniedrigung seinerseits bekennen, hat aber einen Ausdruck gewählt, welcher (wie selbst *Hilgenfeld*, *Galaterbrief*, 174, bemerkt) zu der vaterlosen Erzeugung Jesu trefflich stimmt, ohne sie ausdrücklich zu bezeugen' (Lechler, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, 3. Aufl. pp. 333, 334).

[3] *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 280–282.

Rom. i. 3, 4, which is not incompatible with the miraculous conception; the other is Gal. iv. 4. The expression 'born of a woman' is no doubt, as Steck reminds us, a mode of speech common both to the Old and to the New Testament (Job xiv. 1; Matt. xi. 11 [1]), and it may be quite compatible with the birth of Jesus from a human father and mother; but it cannot be denied, continues Steck, that it can just as well be connected with the thought of a miraculous conception, and this, not because only the mother, and not the father, is spoken of, but because the two following expressions are correlative to the two which precede: *ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ* forms a contrast to *γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον*, and in the same way *ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν* to *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*: the divine exaltation in the appointment to the Sonship is contrasted with the human lowliness in the birth from a woman: Christ is born of a woman, that we may become the sons of God, and therefore He from whom this result proceeds is Himself the Son of God; and this is the other side to His human birth. In Steck's view this passage accordingly leads to the same result as Rom. i. 3, 4, and it must remain undecided as to whether the appearance of Christ amongst men, coupled with the natural factor of His birth from a woman, does not include in addition the supernatural factor of a conception by the Holy Ghost. But the latter, adds Steck, is more probable, if we take into consideration the passage in John i. 12, 13, 'But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God . . . which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' Here the sonship of believers is manifestly described, just as we may conceive of the Sonship of Jesus, as a birth from God, not through human instrumentality. But Steck believes that the expressions *οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός* evidently allude to the previous histories of the Synoptists, and that one can connect their assertions of the miraculous conception of Jesus with this Johannine comprehension of it. According to him the

[1] Lightfoot (p. 168) *from the same passages* decides that there is no reference in Gal. iv. 4 to the miraculous Incarnation.

balance of probabilities, therefore, decidedly favours the view that John, although he did not teach it, silently presupposes the miraculous birth of Jesus: and so it is with Paul. Both Paul and John, indeed, ascribe to Christ in their speculative explanation of the divine side of His Person infinitely more than could be ascribed to Him by the mere fact of His miraculous birth alone. We can thus understand, in Steck's judgment, how the representation of the latter fact falls into the background, and becomes more and more handed over to the popular consciousness of the Church, while the progress of dogma enters upon another road. But Steck forbids us to suppose that Paul was not yet acquainted with the whole representation, when we consider the similarity of his expressions to those of John: for in the case of John no one would affirm that the date of his writing forbade his acquaintance with any of the facts of the case.

To understand fully this language of Steck we must remember that he had previously spoken of the *Hauptbriefe* as containing beyond doubt the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence, and that although he does not discuss the meaning of the phrase '*God sent forth his Son*' in his criticism of Gal. iv. 4, he had already referred to it as pre-supposing Christ's heavenly pre-existence, and had previously maintained that if by His Resurrection Christ was first plainly declared to be the Son of God (Rom. i. 4), yet this was what He really had been before His appearance upon earth.[1]

We are able, indeed, to derive another testimony from an unexpected quarter to the impression made by the whole verse Gal. iv. 4, and to its direct bearing upon Christ's pre-existence. There is a passage in Dr. Martineau's 'Seat of Authority in Religion' which reads for the most part as if it was a declaration of the most orthodox Christian belief. After speaking of the heavenly Christ, he goes on to say that His pre-existence is undoubtedly implied throughout even the Pauline letters which find no occasion to give it direct expres-

[1] We may add that Steck's criticism is of additional importance because it shows us that, so far as language is concerned, the silence of St. John as to the miraculous birth of Jesus is by no means conclusive of his ignorance of the fact.

sion: 'Could the birthday of a human being be announced, for instance, in these terms: "When the fulness of the time was come;" or, again: "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh?" &c. &c. One who is "sent" is presumed to be there in readiness for the mission; and the predicates enumerated, His being made of flesh, and having a mother, and being under the law, might be taken for granted of a Palestinian Jew, and could not be specified except of One to whose nature they did not properly or necessarily belong. Such language is applicable only to a spiritual being passing into the conditions of an incarnate life. If more unmistakable statements are required, they are supplied by passages in which the appearance of Jesus on earth, instead of being referred to the grace of God, is described as His own voluntary act.'[1] So, too, Pfleiderer, although he thinks it much more probable that in this passage, taken in connection with Rom. i. 3 and ix. 5, there is nothing to show that Paul knew of a miraculous conception, does not hesitate to lay stress upon its testimony to the Apostle's belief in the pre-existence of Christ, and to point out that the fact of that belief prevents us from supposing that Paul regarded Christ as an ordinary man, whether miraculously conceived or not.[2]

[1] *Seat of Authority in Religion*, pp. 392, 393.

[2] Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, pp. 217, 222.

After asserting that Paul refrains from any positive statement as to whether Christ was conceived naturally or supernaturally, but that the probabilities are overwhelming in favour of the Apostle holding the former view (see below for Pfleiderer's reason), Pfleiderer adds: 'Der Einwand, dass unter dieser Voraussetzung Paulus Christum nur für einen gewöhnlichen Menschen, nicht aber für den sündlosen Gottessohn hätte halten können, trifft darum nicht zu, weil ja die Gottessohnschaft, wie wir oben sahen, eine Wesensbestimmung ist, welche schon dem präexistenten Christus vermöge seines Heiligkeitsgeistes zukam, welche also gänzlich unabhängig ist von der Entstehungsweise seines Fleischesleibs bei der Inkarnation' (pp. 221, 222).

It is specially to be noted that Dr. Martineau (*ubi supra*, p. 394) (in view of his interpretation of such passages as 1 Cor. x. 4, 2 Cor. viii. 9) pointedly describes the pre-existent Christ as a *personal being*; on this view, in contrast with those who maintain that the pre-existent Christ was only an ideal being, or a life-giving principle, see below, pp. 269 ff.

We may compare with Dr. Martineau's view, and with Pfleiderer's ascription to the pre-existent Christ of acts which could only be those of a *personal being* (cf. *Paulinismus*, pp. 138 &c., and *Urchristenthum*, p. 217; also Weizsäcker,

But whilst it is true that Paul emphasises, with Peter and the other Apostles, the fact that Jesus as the Messiah was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, that His human lineage was derived from the Jewish fathers, it is evident that he regards Him also from another point of view, which many thoughtful readers have considered to carry with it a belief in the miraculous conception. If, indeed, Paul represents Christ as the second Adam, as the pure and sinless Head of humanity, in contrast to the first Adam, through whose transgression a sinful taint has been inherited by every member of his race; and if he further describes Him as the second man from heaven, as the first man was of the earth, then it would seem as if a new creative act of God, a miraculous conception of Jesus, was an almost indispensable consequence in the system of Pauline theology.[1] It must not be forgotten that an exactly opposite view maintains that it is a question whether there is any place for the supernatural conception in Paul's system, and that the Apostle neither denies nor confirms the narratives of Matthew and Luke,[2]

Das apost. Zeitalter, pp. 126, 127), the remarks of Lechler on 2 Cor. viii. 9: 'Accordingly here, also, a prehistoric existence of the Redeemer is presupposed, and, indeed, since his becoming man is represented as an example of self-sacrifice and denial, a real *personal* life, capable of *action*' (*Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 317). He immediately connects with these remarks the passage 1 Cor. x. 4 (on which, and on 2 Cor. viii. 9, see more fully in the following pages of this chapter), and explains it like Dr. Martineau of a personal operation of Christ in the national history (*ubi supra*, pp. 317, 318).

[1] This is admitted by Weiss, who speaks of the miraculous conception and a new creative act of God in the case of the one sinless man as 'diese allerdings für sein System [*i.e.* Paul's] *fast unerlässliche* Consequenz' (cf. *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 289, 290); although he decides that we have no means of knowing whether Paul really drew any such consequence. At the same time he does not think that we are justified in *denying* the miraculous birth from such passages as Rom. i. 3 (as Pfleiderer does), which speaks of Christ as of the seed of David, since the Evangelists who inform us of the miraculous conception equally inform us of the descent of Christ from the patriarchs (*ubi supra*, p. 289, and note 3).

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 292, 309, 310.

'On peut même se demander s'il y a place dans la conception de Paul pour cette naissance surnaturelle. Le rôle que ce fait prend dans la théologie ecclésiastique est rempli dans le système de l'Apôtre par celui de la résurrection.' So, too, when treating of Rom. i. 3, 4, he says: 'Il n'est point ici question de la conception miraculeuse de Jésus dans le sein de la vierge Marie par une vertu spéciale du Saint-Esprit. Paul ne combat ni ne confirme les récits de Luc et de Matthieu; il les ignore absolument' (p. 309).

but absolutely ignores them ; yet it is certainly strange that writers who recognise in the birth of Christ a special manifestation of creative action should refuse to admit that the miraculous conception was the mode of that action ;[1] and it is none the less strange that critics who are never tired of pointing out that Paul's thoughts moved around two facts, and two only, the death and resurrection of Jesus, should express surprise at his apparent ignorance of the fact of the Incarnation, which did not form the centre of his gospel of salvation.[2]

One thing is certain, that the references to the birth and early life of Jesus in the Pauline Epistles are in harmony with the narratives of the Gospels, and that we have no right to expect more from epistolary documents which, as we shall have occasion to see, often presuppose the acquaintance of their readers with many incidents relating to the historical Christ.[3]

[1] De Pressensé, *Jésus-Christ*, p. 274, note, 7th edit. 1884. In this note, after giving a brief and useful summary of Weiss's defence of the narratives of the Incarnation, De Pressensé adds : 'MM. Keim et Sabatier reconnaissent dans la naissance du Christ une manifestation spéciale de l'action créatrice. Pourquo ne pas admettre que la conception miraculeuse a été le mode de cette action ?' To the same effect Godet in his *Commentaire sur L'Evangile de Saint Luc*, pp. 212–216, 3rd edit. 1888.

[2] Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* (edited by Weizsäcker), p. 33, 5. Aufl. 1886.

[3] Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 59, 1891.

In his comparison of the Pauline system of doctrine with the writings of St. Luke, C. F. Schmid refers to the contradiction which has sometimes been alleged to exist between Paul's doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ and His supernatural conception with which the third Gospel commences. But, as he proceeds to point out, this supernatural entrance into life exactly corresponds with the Pauline idea of Christ as the new starting-point for humanity, and as the quickening Spirit. The pre-existent Divine Being must by some such event as the Incarnation create a life in humanity, which is presupposed to be truly susceptible of it. If we add to this the Pauline teaching of the σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, and that the sinless Christ could only appear ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκός, it can be inferred from the whole circle of Paul's ideas that Christ could only enter humanity by the cancelling of the natural continuity, just as this took place, according to the Gospel, by the supernatural conception. It is also remarkable, adds Schmid, that the same Gospel traces back the genealogy of Jesus, not merely to Abraham, but even up to Adam, and through him to God. Thus, quite in accordance with Paul's teaching, and the universalism of the Gospel, Christ stands contrasted with the first man, as the second and higher starting-point of humanity. Schmid, *Biblische Theologie des N. T.* pp. 552, 553, 5. Aufl. 1886 ; see also pp. 34, 35.

So, too, Lechler (*ubi supra*, p. 334, note 1) acknowledges that in the

But if the Acts is to be placed as late as many modern critics demand, it is certainly remarkable that, although the

expression γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός (Gal. iv. 4) 'die Zeugung Jesu durch Gottes wunderbare Wirkung, ohne Zuthun eines Mannes, hiemit weder ausgeschlossen noch in den Worten eingeschlossen ist;' but he adds that we cannot argue from the Apostle's silence here that he taught the natural birth of Jesus, nor from Rom. i. 3, where the Davidic origin of Mary is in no way excluded in the affirmation of Christ's descent from David, as Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 221, and Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 14, assert.

In describing Jesus as 'of the seed of David,' and as descended from the fathers, Lechler maintains that Paul was only in agreement with Peter and the other Apostles, but he adds that, on the other hand, there was another point of view peculiar to Paul, in which he regards Jesus as the new man, the beginning of a new humanity, the second Adam, Rom. v. 15, and 1 Cor. xv. 45 ff., and he lays stress upon this parallel with Adam, who came directly from the Creator's hand, the first ancestor of mankind, as showing, on the one hand, the real humanity of Jesus, and, on the other hand, that a supernatural conception of Jesus was not irreconcilable with Pauline teaching (Lechler, *ubi supra*, pp. 335 and note 1).

With these remarks we may compare those of Neander in his *Leben Jesu*, p. 17, note, E. T.: 'Nor is Paul's silence on this point [viz. the miraculous conception] proof of his not acknowledging it. It only shows that, for his religious sense, the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, the centre and support of the Christian system, stand out more prominently than the miraculous conception. In the passages in which he speaks of Christ's origin he had a different object in view from the treatment of this subject; *e.g.* in Rom. ix. 5, and in Rom. i. 4, where he brings out prominently the twofold manifestation of Christ, as the Son of David and as the Son of God, raised above all human and national relationships, as He revealed Himself after the Resurrection. If we could infer from such passages Paul's disbelief in the miracle, we can draw precisely the opposite conclusion from Gal. iv. 4; although, as the case is, we do not lay much stress upon the expression "born of a woman."

'And if,' adds Neander, 'Paul could represent Jesus as the Son of God from heaven, as being without sin in the flesh (σάρξ), in which sin before had reigned, *while at the same time he taught the propagation of sinfulness from Adam down, it is likely that the supernatural generation of Jesus was so firmly established in the connection of his own thoughts, that he felt the less necessity to give it individual prominence.* We shall have occasion to make a similar remark hereafter in regard to the omission of the account of Christ's Ascension as an individual event.'

Cf. also Huraut, *Paul a-t-il connu le Christ historique?* p. 15, for a similar argument. Speaking of Gal. iv. 4, he remarks: 'Cette dernière expression nous semble contenir une allusion à la naissance miraculeuse du Sauveur. D'ailleurs, la doctrine de saint Paul de la transmission du péché d'Adam à tous ses descendants, prouve qu'il a connu ce fait. Si par le péché d'un seul tous sont rendus pécheurs, et si, d'un autre côté, Christ n'a point connu le péché, il s'ensuit qu'il ne doit point descendre d'Adam au même titre que les autres hommes. Sa naissance ne saurait etre une naissance ordinaire. Si saint Paul avait ignoré la naissance miraculeuse du Sauveur, sa doctrine ne lui eût pas permis d'exempter Jésus-Christ de la tache originelle, puisque, selon lui, nous sommes tous par nature des enfants de colère.'

date of its alleged composition allows time for the growth of any number of miraculous stories, the only point in connection with the birth of Jesus which it emphasises is that to which St. Paul directly refers in Rom. i. 1—viz. His descent from David.[1] The temptation to put into the mouths of the earliest preachers of Christianity some further reference to the events surrounding the birth of Jesus must, one would think, have been well-nigh irresistible. And yet the same reserve is maintained, whether we are listening to the Peter and the Paul of the Epistles, or to the Peter and the Paul of the Acts.

But it must also not be forgotten that the expression used by St. Paul in Gal. iv. 4 does not stand alone. When writing

[1] Cf. Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 401, and see Acts ii. 30 and xiii. 23. In 2 Tim. ii. 8 there is a statement which is closely parallel with that in Rom. i. 3 (cf. also ix. 5). 'Remember,' writes St. Paul, 'that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel.' It has been thought that these words may have formed part of a recognised profession of faith (comp. Mill, *Mythical Interpretation*, &c. p. 208, and especially Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 461, and note, 5. Aufl. 1888). On this descent of Christ from David Neander well remarks (*Life of Christ*, p. 20, note, E. T.) that the fact must have been admitted from the beginning, and that the Evangelists took it for granted as indisputable: 'Could the Apostles have embraced a notion which the Saviour Himself had denounced as an invention of the scribes? There was nothing in Paul's turn of feeling or thought to incline him towards it, had it not been established on other grounds; on the contrary, the doctrine that Christ was *not* the Son of David, but the Son of God and the Lord of David, would have afforded him an excellent point of attack against Judaism.' (Compare also the remarks which follow, and those of Pressensé, *Jésus-Christ*, p. 272, 7th edit., as against the strictures of Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 206, on this statement in 2 Tim. ii. 8). With this we may compare Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 205: 'Paul in accordance with his whole conception of Christ and His work, had not the slightest occasion to establish Christ's claim to the throne of Israel, for the re-establishment of which he no longer hoped, and yet he has no doubt of the fact that Christ was descended from the seed of David according to the flesh.' On the significance of the title 'Son of David,' Dr. Edersheim's *Warburtonian Lectures*, p. 17, may be consulted.

On the genuineness of 2 Tim. see esp. Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 122 ff. 6. Aufl. 1887 (although he rejects 1 Tim. and Titus); Salmon, *Introd. to N. T.* pp. 408-413, 5th edit. 1891, and with his remarks as to the concessions made by Hausrath, Pfleiderer, and Ewald with regard to 2 Tim. compare the attention directed to them by Gloël in *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, p. 91, 1870; for a recent defence of the three Epistles and a summary of the arguments against them, the reader may be referred to *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, pp. 156–202, 1887, by Fr. Roos, whose name is not unknown in England in connection with recent Old Testament criticism.

to the Romans, the Apostle tells them 'what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, *God sending his own Son, in the likeness of sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh' (Rom. viii. 3), *ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*: and in verse 32 he uses a still stronger expression: *ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο*, 'he spared not *his own Son* . . .' The reflexive pronoun in verse 3 points to a reciprocal unity of being between Christ and God the Father, which is still further emphasised by the *ἴδιος* of verse 32,[1] and even if the expression 'sending' does not seem to convey such a forcible meaning as 'sent forth' (*ἐξαπέστειλεν*) in Gal. iv. 4, it will be noticed that the Apostle at once adds 'in likeness of flesh of sin,' as if such a likeness was something added—something different from Christ's original and essential nature.[2]

[1] Lechler draws attention to these expressions in an important passage: 'Lassen wir das *πέμψας* einstweilen bei Seite, so fällt in's Auge, wie innig die gegenseitige Wesensverbindung zwischen Jesu und Gott dem Vater *durch das reflexive Pronomen* erscheint, obschon das einfache *Pronomen personale*, welches hier so gut als Gal. i. 16 stehen konnte, einen bedeutenden Inhalt hat. *Noch stärker lautet die Aussage Röm. viii. 32. Fassen wir den sonstigen Gebrauch des ἴδιος bei Paulus in's Auge, so können wir nicht umhin, in demselben hier einen besonderen Nachdruck anzuerkennen, auf welchen zugleich der unmittelbare Zusammenhang unserer Stelle deutlich hinweist.* Ist dies der Fall, so sagt der Apostel eine ganze innige ausschliessliche Wesensgemeinschaft zwischen Jesu und Gott dem Vater aus; mit andern Worten, es wird Jesu hiermit *nicht etwa blos eine theokratische Würde, sondern die metaphysische Sohnschaft Gottes beigelegt*' (*ubi supra*, p. 314).

So, too, Sabatier draws attention to the latter expression, *ἴδιος*. 'Aussi Paul appelle-t-il le Christ, d'une manière évidemment spéciale, le *propre* Fils de Dieu (*ἴδιον υἱὸν*, Rom. viii. 32). . . . En un mot, Christ est le propre fils, le fils *essentiel* de Dieu; nous ne le sommes, et ne le serons jamais que par adoption' (*ubi supra*, p. 313). The italics are Sabatier's. Compare P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, pp. 81, 82. See also Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 59 and 248, 1891.

[2] Hiernach schaut ihn der Apostel nicht ursprünglich und wesentlich als Menschen an, sondern die menschliche Erscheinung ist etwas Sekundäres. Diese *σάρξ* ist erst hinzugekommen zu dem, was Christus vorher schon war' (Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 505).

Upon the significance of the expression 'in likeness of flesh of sin,' see Lechler, *ubi supra*, 334, who points out that here, as in Phil. ii. 7, *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων*, the real humanity of Jesus is not questioned, since *ὁμοίωμα* relates, not to the *σὰρξ* alone, but to the *σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας*. So, too, in Phil. ii. 7, the Apostle does not say *ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπου*, an expression which would approach nearer to Docetism than the words used in this passage, Rom. viii. 3, but *ἀνθρώπων*, the

Jesus Christ, then, of whom the Apostle is speaking, is God's *own Son*— not merely 'a son of God' as any Hebrew might claim the title, not merely 'a son of God' as the Roman centurion might describe a national hero, or the patient Sufferer 'dying so lordly' upon the Cross, but in a far higher and unique sense.[1]

It is the same expression which St. John uses when he tells us that 'the Jews sought the more to kill Jesus, because he not only broke the Sabbath, but called God *His own Father* (ἴδιος), making himself equal with God.'[2] But St. Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, who, like his countrymen, would shrink back with horror, as from blasphemy, at the thought of a man claiming equality with God, does not hesitate, in one of his generally accepted Epistles, to use the same term ἴδιος of Him who had been born of a woman, made under the law, and who had suffered death upon the cross some five-and-twenty or eight-and-twenty years before the Apostle penned his words.[3]

plural evidently signifying that Christ came in the likeness of ordinary men. Ullmann, *Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, p. 144, note, 7. Aufl. 1883.

For a lengthy examination of Holsten's view that Jesus by an innate propensity was subject to sin, although he remained pure from actual sin (*Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, pp. 436 ff.), see Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 306–308.

Comp. also Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.*, in opposition to any idea of Docetism in such words as ὁμοίωμα or μορφή (Phil. ii. 6, 7).

[1] Keim, in spite of his strictures in the note which follows, and of his denial that Jesus claims equality with God, or even divine origin, is, nevertheless, constrained to admit that Jesus was not only a Master exalted above past, present, and future, the first Messenger of God, but that He was more than that, viz. the well-beloved, *the Son of God above all sons, in whose knowledge and fellowship the Father is satisfied, as He, the Son, is satisfied in the Father* (*Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 626).

Amongst more recent English writers, the author of *Paul of Tarsus* (p. 139) is constrained to admit that it is difficult to reconcile the view that Paul regarded Jesus only as a human prophet with the plain language of his letters; it is certain that the Apostle believed Him to have been the Son of God, by whom the world had been made, and though all Israel were 'sons of God,' Paul, if we may take his writings as evidence, held that the nature of Jesus was something more than mortal.

[2] P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, pp. 81, 82; Humphry, *Commentary on the R. V.* p. 148. On the force of ἴδιος see even Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 276.

[3] Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 509, 5. Aufl. Fr. Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, pp. 89, 90, and 223, where he points out that Paul most probably deduced his Christology from the historical

Now, if this remarkable expression had occurred in one of the later Epistles—in the Paul *des derniers temps*, in one of the Epistles of the Captivity, to say nothing of the Pastoral Epistles—attention would at once have been called to it as a signal instance of the Apostle's advanced Christology. But here it is in one of his generally accepted writings, to which 58 or 59 A.D. is assigned as a date. Indeed, before we speak of St. Paul's advanced Christology, we ought to ask ourselves how far such an expression can be justified.[1]

Certainly, as the Apostle grew older, he found with changing circumstances and surroundings that questions which at an earlier date could never have arisen in the same form imperatively demanded an answer. What, men were

sayings of Jesus, and not merely from his own conclusions based upon the life and character of Jesus, a probability which gains support from the consideration of the Jewish monotheism of the Apostle, and what it must have cost him to entertain a view of the Person of Jesus which was in such direct contrast with his own deepest consciousness as a Jew, as also from the fact that the Apostle had to maintain his Christology against the attacks of opponents, which would have been a well-nigh inconceivable task if he had been obliged to depend entirely upon his own logical conclusions without any knowledge of the sayings of Jesus as to His own Person. Compare P. Ewald, *ubi supra*, p. 85.

[1] Very little reference is made in the following pages to the Epistle to the Ephesians, because, although Reuss has defended it so admirably (*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 110 ff. 6. Aufl.), there is no such general testimony in its favour as for 1 Thess., Phil., or even for part of Colossians. Some of the earliest authorities referred to in chap. ii. expressed their doubts about it, or rejected it, referring it at best to a member of the Pauline school (Hase, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 140 ('Vorlesungen'); Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 8; Ewald, *Sieben Sendschreiben*, p. 153; De Wette, *Lehrbuch N. T.* p. 319); it is placed by Renan in the fourth class alone, as a doubtful Epistle (*Saint Paul*, Introd. 6, 1888); it is rejected by von Soden, who accepts Colossians, although it is referred by him to some one of Paul's personal disciples (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* iii. 96, 100). On the other hand, while Hilgenfeld placed the Epistle as late as about 140 A.D. (*Einleitung*, p. 680), Mangold appears inclined to follow Holtzmann in bringing it within the lines of the first century, or the very beginning of the second (Bleek-Mangold, *Einleitung*, p. 602; comp. also von Soden, *ubi supra*, 99, 100), so that the latest criticism, although rejecting the early date for the Epistle demanded by H. Ewald (75 A.D.), yet returns to his position in ascribing it to one of Paul's immediate followers. There is great force in the criticism of B. Weiss (*Einleitung*, p. 269, 2. Aufl.), that although the Epistle undoubtedly contains in its doctrine and expressions much that is peculiar when compared with the older Pauline writings, yet if once the Epistle to the Colossians is regarded as genuine, an advance of Paulinism must be granted, both in doctrine and expression, which explains the Ephesian Epistle just as well as the Colossian one.

asking at Ephesus and Colosse—what was Christ's place in the scale of being? What was His rank? How was He to be regarded amidst thrones and dominions and hierarchies and powers?[1]

Such questions contain in themselves a sufficient answer to any objection against St. Paul's use of terms which were demanded by the occasion and justified by the interests imperilled—it was the sovereignty of Christ which was at stake, it was *that* which men sought to compromise; it was no longer the great doctrines of justification by faith or of universal redemption which were assailed, but the Person of Him, apart from whom there was no justification and no redemption: compromise was excluded, for, far above all principalities and powers, all those countless æons which disputed with Him the work of redemption, or the angels who divided with Him the honour of worship—far above every name which was named in this age or in that which is to come—there is the throne of the dear Son of the Father—in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead—who is before all things, and by whom all things consist.[2]

But whilst we readily admit that in the two Epistles, Colossians and Ephesians, St. Paul is plainly opposing some alien philosophy, it does not in the least follow that such an admission involves the surrender of either Epistle. The argument from language upon which the opponents of these Epistles so strongly rely is always a precarious one, and the warning in this instance of Schenkel, in his defence of another Epistle (that to the Philippians), might well be borne in mind by students of his own school—viz. that it is not allowable to confine the vocabulary of a genius so rich and original as that of Paul to the fund of language contained in four earlier letters.[3] No doubt there are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα in these two Epistles, and one of them, as Reuss reminds us, is ἄφεσις (only found once in each of these Epistles); but is it to be

[1] Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 116, 117, 6. Aufl. Comp. also Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 495, 508, 5. Aufl.; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 193–199.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 199.

[3] *Das Christusbild des Apostels Paulus*, p. 91.

supposed, asks Reuss, that the genuine Paul has never spoken elsewhere of the forgiveness of sins?[1] No doubt there are philosophical terms, expressions kindred to Gnostic ideas; but not only are many of these terms found in the oldest and most undoubted writings of the New Testament, not only are those which undeniably contain a Gnostic element old enough and Jewish enough to have been well known to Paul,[2] but the more the Gnostic element is insisted upon, the more inconceivable does it become that a forger, writing with a 'tendency,' as the Tübingen school would say—*i.e.* with the object of reconciling the parties of Peter and Paul—should have imagined that the best way of effecting such a reconciliation was to introduce the language of heretics equally obnoxious to Petrine and Pauline alike.[3] Nor must it be forgotten that the borrowing may have been often on the other side, and that Renan has candidly admitted that, instead of rejecting the Epistle to the Colossians because in certain passages it contains traces of Gnosticism, we should sometimes reason inversely, and seek in these passages the origin of the Gnostic ideas which prevailed in the second century.[4]

But it must not be forgotten that, so far as the Apostle's Christology is concerned, similar expressions are found in earlier and generally accepted Epistles (cf. especially 1 Cor. viii. 6, 2 Cor. iv. 4);[5] and Reuss reminds us also that this conception of Christ in Col. i. 15 ff., which is often described as

[1] Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 115.

[2] Reuss, *ubi supra*, pp. 118, 119. [3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Saint Paul*, Introd. x, xi, 12th edit.; Reuss, *ubi supra*, p. 119; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 212.

[5] Renan, *Saint Paul*, Introduction, p. x, 12th edit.: 'Nous montrerons même que les plus énergiques expressions de l'épître aux Colossiens ne font qu'enchérir un peu sur celles des épîtres antérieures:' *note*, 'Voir surtout, Rom. ix. 5, 1 Cor. viii. 6, 2 Cor. v. 19.' Again, on p. 275, he writes: 'Les formules les plus avancées que nous trouverons dans l'Epître aux Colossiens existent déjà en germe dans les épîtres plus anciennes, 1 Cor. viii. 6.' In his *L'Antechrist*, Renan is again obliged to admit that at least the germ of St. Paul's later Christology is contained in his earlier and undoubted Epistles (pp. 77, 83); but it is difficult to understand how he allows that the Epistle to the Colossians was written by St. Paul, 'a Hebrew of the Hebrews,' and yet asks us to believe that Christian mythology and metaphysics were born in Paul's Churches amongst men who found the idea of a God made man quite simple, whilst, in Renan's own words,

Gnostic, or later than the Pauline theology, is to be found in the Apocalypse (iii. 14).[1] But why should a Christian Jew, writing, as so many modern critics would have us believe, in 68 A.D.,[2] be able to use such an expression as ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ (the significance of which we can only fully estimate if we compare it with the familiar Apocalyptic formula ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος),[3] whilst the phraseology of the Epistle to the Colossians (cf. i. 15–18) is to be referred only to the time of Christ's redemptive work, and not to His pre-existence ; or to be dismissed as borrowed from the Book of Enoch or as characteristic of the second century ?[4]

If it be urged that in Col. i. 18 Christ is described as ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, and that this latter expression limits the force of ἀρχή, it is to be remembered that in the Apocalypse our Lord is also πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν (i. 5), and that St. Paul has just called Him πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.[5]

for the Jews the incarnation of the Divinity was a thing blasphemous and revolting ! (pp. 85–90).

On the force of the expressions used in Paul's earlier Epistles, comp. also Reuss, *ubi supra*, pp. 116, 119. Lechler, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, pp. 315, 320, 3. Aufl. ; Hase, *Kirchengeschichte* (Vorlesungen), erster Theil, p. 140.

[1] Reuss, *ubi supra*, pp. 117–119, 149 ; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 559, 5. Aufl.

[2] It will be noticed that Dr. Salmon in the last edition of his *Introduction*, pp. 243, 244, expresses himself as disposed to accept the testimony of Irenæus, and to place the Apocalypse, not in the reign of Nero, but in the early years of that of Domitian. For the recent literature upon the Apocalypse, it may be sufficient to refer to Holtzmann's review of it in the *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* iv. 257, and to refer to the replies to the disintegrating theories of Völter and Vischer made by Reuss in his *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 147, 1887, 6. Aufl., and by Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschrift für wissen. Theologie*, p. 396 f. 1882 ; 374–378, 1888 ; 385–468, 1890 ; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 102 138, 1888. Comp. also Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 375, 376, note, 1889, 2. Aufl.

[3] Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 448, 449. 3. Aufl.

[4] See esp. Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, pp. 142 ff. 4th edit.

[5] On the force of this last expression see esp. Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 508, 509, 5. Aufl.

Comp. also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 426, note, 5. Aufl. ; Grimm, *N. T. Lexicon*, p. 386, on the strictures of Baur.

Cremer's *Wörterbuch*, pp. 559, 560. Edersheim points out that while Philo uses the word πρωτόγονος, St. Paul says πρωτότοκος (Article 'Philo,' Smith and Wace's Dict.). Comp. Lightfoot, *Colossians, in loco*, pp. 212, 213, where he

But this passage in the Epistle to the Colossians has a parallel in 1 Cor. viii. 6, where essentially the same idea is expressed as in Col. i. 16. At the same time, in neither passage is there the least justification for the view which would restrict the Apostle's meaning to the redemptive work of Christ, or to a moral creation, as Baur and Schenkel maintained,[1] and a much truer judgment affirms how fully in such expressions St. Paul, no less than St. John, taught the doctrine of the Logos.[2]

But if it can be fairly argued that no small proof of the correctness of this interpretation is to be found in the violent attempts to explain it away, the same may certainly be said of another great Christological passage, to which we are now justified in referring, even if the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians are denied us. The extraordinary interpretation put upon Phil. ii. 6, 7 by Baur has justly merited the emphatic condemnation of Reuss, and one may well ask whether it is really any longer necessary to refute it.[3]

remarks that πρωτότοκος is preferred by St. Paul to πρωτόγονος, a favourite term, as we may infer from Philo, with the Alexandrians, while πρωτότοκος would include the Messianic reference as well. We are also reminded by the same authority of the significant fact that St. Paul does not say πρωτόκτιστος.

[1] See Weiss on Baur and Schenkel, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 297, and note, 5. Aufl., and also Sabatier's criticism in his *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 218, and that of Pfleiderer in *Urchristenthum*, esp. p. 214. Comp. also Keim, as against Baur, *ubi supra*, i. 42 and 345. To these criticisms we may add the valuable remarks of Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 318, 319, and note, and those of Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 495, 496, as against the strictures of Dr. Martineau on 1 Cor. viii. 6, *Seat of Authority*, p. 393 (comp. Schenkel, *Das Christusbild*, p. 282). It may be added that Steck in his examination of Paul's Christology regards the passage as speaking of Christ as the instrument in the creation of the world, and points out the difficulty of rejecting such an interpretation (*Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 276, 279).

[2] Comp. Chap. v. p. 330; Salmon, *Introduction to the N. T.* p. 201, 5th edit.

[3] Reuss points out that the much debated expression ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο can, according to its context, have no other than the natural meaning: 'Although in the possession of a divine essence he would not retain this equality with God by force:' ἁρπαγμὸς is used because the decree of God demanded the κένωσις (an idea which everywhere lies at the foundation of the Apostle's representation of the sufferings and obedience of the Son of God, 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Gal. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 32, although the word is elsewhere wanting), and therefore the refusal to submit to this κένωσις must have expressed itself in forcibly grasping something which ought temporarily to have been surrendered. But, adds Reuss, to express this thought no one needed to have read into the passage the history (as Baur sup-

Nor can it be said that Schenkel's endeavour to explain the expression *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ* by a reference to Gen. i. 27 and by supposing that the Apostle is merely instituting a moral comparison between the first and second Adam has been any more successful.[1] It is impossible to ignore the force of the whole phrase *ὑπάρχων ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ*: such words express an essential relationship with God, and although Paul speaks of man in his present state of being as the image and glory of God (1 Cor. xi. 7), he would never, as Sabatier reminds us, have said of us, as of Christ, *ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχοντες*. As for the charge of Docetism which Baur and others have brought against this passage, not only is such an interpretation directly opposed to the express intention of the Apostle—since the exaltation of Christ could not have been the result of a humiliation and obedience and death which were only apparent and unreal—but, as both Reuss and Sabatier insist, no idea of Docetism is to be found in the word *μορφή*, since it is employed also of the divine substance, nor in *ὁμοίωμα* (cf. Rom. viii. 3, i. 23), nor in such terms as *σχῆμα* and *εὑρεθῆναι*, which always indicate an objective reality (1 Cor. vii. 31; 1 Cor. iv. 2; Gal. ii. 17).[2]

But without attempting any further examination of these great Christological passages, it is necessary to remind ourselves of one very significant word, common to the earliest and the latest Epistles of St. Paul—the word *Κύριος* applied to Jesus. In the very first words of his earliest Epistle the Apostle speaks of the Church of the Thessalonians, which is 'in God the Father, and *the Lord* Jesus Christ' (1 Thess. i. 1)

poses) of an æon which unduly longed for the *πλήρωμα* and, as a result, fell into the *κένωμα* (*Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 129, 6. Aufl.; so, also, Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 233, and R. Lipsius in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. (2), p. 196, 1891); and see Dr. Liddon's *Divinity of our Lord*, Lect. vi. for this and other Christological passages referred to in the text.

[1] *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, p. 296.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 235 and 233; Reuss, *ubi supra*, p. 129; Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 218; Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 412. For the force of the verb *ὑπάρχειν*, see Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 110, where we are also reminded of the connection between Paul's phraseology, *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ* (ii. 6), and St. John v. 18. On the bearing of the passage upon the human life of Christ, see below, chap. v.

—indeed, the term 'Lord,' or 'our Lord,' occurs some five-and-twenty times in this Epistle alone; for the Church at Corinth the Apostles' Creed is summed up in the warning: 'No man can say that Jesus is *the Lord* but by the Holy Ghost' (1 Cor xii. 3), whilst the Philippians are reminded that every tongue shall confess that 'Jesus Christ is *Lord*' (Phil. ii. 11).

The word is so familiar to us in St. Paul that we are liable to forget the full force and significance of the expression,[1] and it may be useful to recall the fact that no less a critic than Albert Ritschl, after reminding us that Paul directly applies the name of God to the Risen Christ (Rom. ix. 5, Tit. ii. 13), adds that, although this is not more frequently the case, yet we have in the word Κύριος the name which is above every name, and which signifies nothing less than the name of God, and that he refers as proof passages to 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9; comp. Apoc. xix. 16; James ii. 1.[2]

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 11.

[2] *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, pp. 79, 80, and comp. p. 121, 2. Aufl. 1857. Ritschl's words are these: 'Es unterliegt keinem Zweifel, dass Paulus dem Christus, der durch seine Auferstehung zu göttlicher Macht erhoben ist (Röm. viii. 34), unumwunden den Gottesnamen giebt (Röm. ix. 5; Tit. ii.13)' (p. 79). With regard to this much disputed passage in Rom. ix. 5, it must be remembered that Steck has recently admitted that on exegetical grounds there is every reason for referring ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεός to Christ (*Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 285–287). For a similar reference of the words to Christ, see also Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 331, 332; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 511, 5. Aufl.; Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 412; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 282; Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 55, and note (but comp. his *Urchristenthum*, p. 240, 1887).

On the significance of such a passage as 2 Cor. xiii. 14, in the Pauline Christology, see Dr. Matheson's 'Historical Christ of St. Paul' in *Expositor*, vol. ii. 2nd series, p. 153, and Dr. Wace's *Boyle Lectures*, Lect. vii. 284, and Lect. v. 241.

Of the profound reverence with which this monotheism inspires every Jew, we may find some evidence in Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, Aphor. lxvi.: 'The Jews would not willingly tread upon the smallest piece of paper in their way, but took it up; for possibly, said they, the name of God may be on it.' For a remarkable passage upon the monotheism of the Jewish disciples of Jesus, and of the scruples which on this account they would have to overcome in ascribing to Him the language which they undoubtedly used, see Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, p. 305, 1887. At the conclusion of this passage Gess strikingly asks: 'Was wird aber vollends aus dem frommen Monotheisten Jesus selbst wenn er eben nur Josephs Sohn war, dem Gott sich offenbarte, dass

Students of theology in England are no doubt familiar with the Bishop of Derry's Introduction to 1 Thess. in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' in which he dwells upon the importance of the fact that the New Testament writers should thus adopt the term by which the LXX render the most solemn of all the names of God in the Old Testament—the Ineffable Name—Jehovah. It is as 'those who call upon the name of the Lord' that the early Christians are habitually known, and there can be no doubt that, not only do they honour Christ with worship in their use of such a phrase, but that they associate Him with the Jehovah of the Old Testament prophets.[1]

Nor can it be said that such an interpretation is merely put upon the words by orthodox English divines; it may be confirmed by the emphatic testimony of various and recent writers.

Dr. Schmid, *e.g.*, in discussing the Person of Jesus Christ, expresses himself thus: 'Christ is indeed to such an extent the object of religious invocation that it belongs to the idea of a Christian that he should call on the name of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. i. 2; Rom. x. 12); and Paul himself prays to Christ.' 'Indeed,' he adds, 'the very name Κύριος, so constantly employed as a characteristic designation of Jesus Christ, the one Lord, by whom are all things, is here of great weight; for in heathen usage "lord and king" was a designation of the

er Gott seinen Brüdern offenbaren konnte, und dennoch solche Zeugnisse über sich aussprach kraft deren seine Jünger ihn angebetet haben? Je tiefer Jesu Ehrfurcht vor Gott war, desto gewisser hat er gottgleiches Wirken, welches kein Prophet sich zuschrieb, nur dann sich zuerkannt, wenn er das klare Bewusstsein übermenschlicher Wesenheit in sich trug.'

On St. Paul's monotheism, and yet recognition of the Trinity in the Godhead, see Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 333, in connection with 2 Cor. xiii. 14. Comp. also in Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 58, 59, 98, and 248 for a summary of the Pauline passages bearing upon Christ's Pre-existence and Incarnation. Sabatier lays stress upon the fact that we do not find in St. Paul the metaphysics of later days, or the Nicene formula, but if he is prepared to admit—as apparently he is—that such passages as 2 Cor. xiii. 14, cf. 1 Cor. xii. 4–11 are 'the point of departure' for these later expressions of belief, this is all we can expect (*L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 315, 316), and the real question is whether the Nicene Creed is not the only satisfactory explanation of the Apostle's words. See Dr. Wace's article in *Good Words* for 1878, pp. 651 ff., and Dr. Bright's *Lessons from Three Great Fathers*.

[1] *Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iii. pp. 689 ff.; and p. 186 on Rom. x. 12.

highest God; in the Old Testament יְהוָה is translated by Κύριος.'[1] Elsewhere he reminds us that in the midst of His humiliation, when He was crucified, He was Κύριος τῆς δόξης, the Lord of glory (1 Cor. ii. 8);[2] and in an earlier passage he sums up the total impression made upon the Apostles' minds in their intercourse with Jesus, as being precisely that in virtue of which they worshipped Him as the Lord, bowed the knee before Him, and called upon His name (Rom. x. 13, cf. 12 and 9).[3] So, too, Lechler points out that not only does the description of Christians in 1 Cor. i. 2, as 'those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,' imply that divine worship is offered, and actual prayer addressed, to Him, just as worship and prayer are implied in the Old Testament phrase 'to call upon the name of the Lord;' but he adds that still more expressive from this point of view is the way in which, in Rom. x. 13, the words of Joel iii. 5 are directly transferred to Jesus, so that the prayer of believers is addressed to Him in the same sense, and with the same promise, as in the Old Testament to Jehovah.[4]

So, too, the testimony of W. F. Gess may be quoted to the same effect, not only as to the frequent application of the term Κύριος to Christ, but also as to its significance in the passages emphasised by Schmid and Lechler. Thus, in commenting on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, he remarks that in this Epistle mention is made of the Lord almost seventy times. In the Old Testament quotations iii. 20 and xiv. 21, God Himself is meant; in iii. 5 (cf. 6 and 7), iv. 19, viii. 17, x. 26, God rather than Christ; in i. 31, ii. 16, xi. 32, xiv. 37, xvi. 17, the reference is doubtful; but in all other cases the term is without doubt to be referred to Christ. In i. 2, 3, and vi. 13, just as in viii. 6, the Father is specifically God, and Christ specifically Lord. 'But,' adds Gess, 'what conclusions follow from the fact that the same name which

[1] *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 510, 5. Aufl.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 500. On the force of the same expression in James ii. 1, *ibid.* p. 354.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 142.

[4] Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 330; comp. Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, p. 80, note.

the Creator of the world, the God of Israel, bears in the Old Testament, is the specific title assigned to Christ! Add to this that in i. 2, the Christians are characterised as those who call upon the name of the Lord. Comp. Joel iii. 5, in the LXX.'[1] With these remarks we may connect the decisive way in which he refers to Christ the Old Testament prophecy in Romans x. 13, which speaks of Jehovah, and of saving prayer to Him, and expresses his conviction that for the Israelite Paul, for whom the First Commandment had become part and parcel of his very life, such a reference would have been an impossibility, if he had presupposed that Christ was only human.[2]

In his 'Biblical Theology' we find that B. Weiss is equally emphatic in his judgment as to the significance of this term. After pointing out that for St. Paul the peculiar dignity of Christ is comprehended and comprised in the word Κύριος, and that the confession of the Church is summed up in the acknowledgment that Jesus is the Lord (1 Cor. xii. 3, Rom. x. 9, Phil. ii. 11, Col. ii. 6), he adds that Paul refers Old Testament passages which relate to the Κύριος-Jehovah directly to Christ (1 Cor. 16, x. 22, Rom. x. 13), and does not hesitate to draw the full consequences of the bestowal of this name of honour upon Him. The exalted Messiah appears at his return with full divine omniscience, as only He who knows the hearts possesses it (1 Cor. iv. 5); He is prayed to as the Lord (2 Cor. xii. 8), or His name Κύριος is called upon (1 Cor. i. 2, cf. Phil. ii. 10); and Rom. x. 12, 13, where the passage in Joel iii. 5 is referred to Him, plainly shows that this is to be understood in the sense of divine worship.[3]

In commenting on the earlier Epistle, 1 Thessalonians,

[1] *Christi Person und Werk nach Christi Selbstzeugniss und den Zeugnissen der Apostel*, zweite Abtheilung, 1. Hälfte, pp. 128, 129, 2. Aufl. 1887.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 214, and comp. 2. Hälfte, p. 411.

[3] Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 281, 282, 5. Aufl.

'Auch Paulus folgt dem Sprachgebrauch der LXX, in welchem κύριος die Uebersetzung des A.T.lichen Gottesnamens ist, sowohl in seinen eigentlichen Citaten als auch wo er sich A.T.liche Worte aneignet (1 Kor. i. 31, iii. 20, x. 26, xiv. 21; 2 Kor. vi. 17 f., x. 17; Röm. iv. 8, ix. 28 f., x. 16, xi. 3, 34, xii. 19, xiv. 11, xv. 11), und in demselben Sinne gebraucht er κύριος von Gott (1 Kor. iii. 5, iv. 19, vii. 17, x. 9, wo τὸν κύριον zu lesen; xvi. 7; Röm. xiv. 4).' Note, p. 282, and see also p. 211 for the force of the word κύριος as it is employed by Paul in 1 Thess.

Weiss attaches special significance to the manner in which an Old Testament expression like 'the day of the Lord' (1 Thess. v. 2, cf. 2, ii. 2), in which the day of the Lord Jehovah is meant, is transferred without hesitation to Christ,[1] and it will be noticed that whether he is examining the theology of the Acts, or of the first Epistle of Peter, or of the Epistle of James, Weiss reminds his readers of the important bearing of the fact that the Old Testament name of Jehovah, the Κύριος of the LXX, is repeatedly and indubitably referred to Jesus.[2]

If we turn to Sabatier, his testimony as to the force of the word Κύριος is most emphatic. He reminds us how this word, which in the Septuagint is specially used of Jehovah, has become in the Epistles of the New Testament, the peculiar title of Christ (1 Cor. viii. 6); how it implies an absolute sovereignty over the conscience, the Church, and over the world in its historical development; how the fact of its transference to Jesus is in itself sufficient proof that He has become for the Christian conscience that which Jehovah was for the conscience of the Old Testament prophets. Thus 'the day of Jehovah' has become the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Thess. v. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 2).[3]

It would be easy to multiply testimony, but when we find two writers so widely differing in general as Dr. Paul Schanz, Professor in Tübingen, one of the most prominent apologists of the Christian Faith amongst the Roman Catholics, and Dr. Pfleiderer in his 'Hibbert Lectures,' both laying stress upon the manner in which the Old Testament name for God, viz. Κύριος, is given to Christ by St. Paul,[4] it is difficult to suppose that the word is only equivalent to 'Master' or 'Sir,' as any disciples might address their teacher.[5] No doubt the

[1] Weiss *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 212, note. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 130, 170, 181, note.

[3] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 83; comp. Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 74.

[4] Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 414, and Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 55.

[5] It is to be noticed that Professor Estlin Carpenter admits that the term, as it is employed in our Gospels, cannot be thus restricted, and he remarks with reference to 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, that 'the language of the Apostle Paul seems clearly to approach the antique sense of Hebrew Scriptures' (*The First Three Gospels*, pp. 124–127, 2nd edit.).

word is sometimes used in this lower sense in the narratives of the Evangelists, but it is to be observed that in St. Luke's Gospel there are frequent passages in which the term 'the Lord' is used absolutely of Jesus, and that his frequent use of the term in this absolute sense is in striking contrast with its rarer employment by St. Matthew and St. Mark. If, however, St. Luke came into the field later than St. Matthew or St. Mark, and derived, as is probable, much of his information from those who had learnt to speak of Jesus with the highest reverence, this recurrence of the word in his Gospel is easily explained.[1] Nor must it be forgotten that we have not merely to consider the number of times which a writer like St. Paul uses the word Κύριος in reference to Jesus, but the fact that he and his fellow Apostles associate with its use the honour which, in the Old Testament, belonged to God only.[2]

But the habitual reference by St. Paul of the term under discussion to Jesus of Nazareth is of interest also from another point of view. It has lately been argued that in the interval between the date of Jesus' living voice and the period, from forty to seventy years later, during which, it is alleged, our Synoptic Gospels were compiled, the first disciples and their Palestinian converts threw back, as it were, upon the life of Jesus, the Messianic representations in the Book of Daniel, and other Apocalyptic books, and converted a title like 'the Son of Man,' expressive of lowly and equal sympathy among the brotherhood of mankind, into a Jewish Messiah sending forth his angels and coming with his saints to judgment: hence the Evangelists themselves were tempted to patch the discourses of Jesus with shreds of some Jewish Apocalypse; hence the exposition of the 'last things' in our Synoptical Gospels. 'Must we not own,' inquires Dr. Martineau, 'that purely in his character of Messiah coming shortly with his saints to reign, was he called *Lord*; or only as presiding at the great Assize which was to open his reign

[1] Comp. Dean Plumptre, in Ellicott's *Commentary*, vol. i. p. 277, and Farrar, *Messages of the Books*, p. 73, note.

[2] Comp. Westcott's *Epistle to the Hebrews*, pp. 89–91 and Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, *ubi supra*.

was he called *Judge*; and because in that hour his verdict would reserve from the sentence which swept the rest away all those who knew him and bore his name, he was called their *Saviour*?'[1]

But we have only to look at St. Paul's earliest Epistle, 1 Thessalonians, to see that each of these terms is employed by the Apostle in writing at that early date to the Church at Thessalonica; and it would therefore seem that the transformation which Dr. Martineau demands must have taken place in a much shorter period than he is willing to allow, to say nothing of the fact that Paul would hardly have written in a brief letter in such terms to his converts, unless they had possessed some previous knowledge of the Person with regard to whom he asserts these tremendous claims. This Epistle, then, which Dr. Martineau himself admits, would seem to carry us back to a date earlier than itself, when the Christian Church conceived of Jesus as their *Lord*, their *Saviour*, and their *Judge*.

Certainly such expressions as 'the Lord of glory,' 'the second man,' 'the Lord from heaven,' have been subjected to various interpretations.[2] When, *e.g.*, St. Paul says 'the second man is the Lord from heaven,' or, as in R. V. 'the second man is of heaven,' is he speaking of Christ's pre-existence at all? Or, if he refers to His pre-existence, does he not mean that He is pre-existent only as a principle? or, as the ideal, the archetypal man? But if we omit the words ὁ Κύριος in 1 Cor. xv. 47, it does not follow that there is no reference to our Lord's pre-existence,[3] and it is somewhat strange that such a view should have commended itself to the mind of Sabatier, who in his anxiety to emphasise the im-

[1] *Seat of Authority*, p. 356. [2] Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 268 ff.

[3] 'An dieser Stelle nun heisst es ausdrücklich, dass der zweite Mensch ἐξ οὐρανοῦ war (das ὁ κύριος, v. 47, ist zu streichen); dieser Hinweis aber auf seinen himmlischen Ursprung kann nur den Gedanken involviren, dass der, welcher der Menschheit eine ihrer himmlischen Vollendung entsprechende Leiblichkeit vermittelt hat, selbst seinem ursprünglichen Wesen nach ein Himmelsbewohner gewesen sein muss.'

'Allerdings hat er dieselbe nicht etwa vom Himmel mitgebracht, sondern sie selbst erst bei seiner Erhöhung zum Himmel nach der Auferstehung empfangen' (Weiss, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 294).

mense difference which undoubtedly divides the Apostle's thought from that of Philo, denies that 1 Cor. xv. 47 has any reference to the pre-existent, but only to the risen Christ.[1] But this essential difference of nature is marked by the words ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, placed in antithesis to ἐκ τῆς γῆς ; and although it may be maintained that in the Pauline view, Christ received more after His exaltation than He had possessed before He became man, yet, both here and elsewhere, Paul conceives of Him as in His origin more than man.[2]

But it is much more surprising to find that Sabatier allows that in Paul's view Christ was pre-existent as the Son of God, and yet that he seems in doubt as to whether the Apostle conceives of this pre-existence as ideal or personal,[3] and that he falls back upon his favourite position that Christ was in the essence of His being *the Spirit* (not simply πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν, but, as in 2 Cor. iii. 17, ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν), the divine Spirit, under the form of a human individuality.[4] The Apostle, according to Sabatier, confounds the pre-historic activity of the Christ with that of this divine πνεῦμα, which appeared as a human person in Christ, but to which it becomes difficult,

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 310, 311, 312 : 'Les mots ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (v. 47), n'impliquent nullement la préexistence, et l'on se trompe gravement quand on en conclut que, aux yeux de l'apôtre, la préexistence du Christ était celle de l'*homme idéal*, de l'*homme type*.' This last idea, Sabatier adds, belongs to the system of Philo, and between that and the system of Paul *the difference is radical*. 'Philon se place toujours au point de vue de la pure spéculation ; Paul reste fidèle au point de vue historique. L'un dira que l'homme idéal est le premier, et que l'homme psychique, reproduction imparfaite du type divin, vient le second ; l'autre, au contraire, affirme expressément que l'homme psychique apparaît d'abord, et l'homme spirituel ensuite.'

But having thus drawn a distinction between Philo and the Apostle, Sabatier at once limits the term ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ to the Risen Christ, and refers in proof to the context.

[2] Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. N. T.* pp. 294, 295.

Comp. also pp. 295, 296, where after discussing Rom. i. 4, he concludes : 'Der Sohn Gottes aber, der in der Theilnahme an der göttlichen Würde und Weltherrschaft seine Vollendung gefunden hatte, konnte von Anbeginn an kein menschlich-geschöpfliches Wesen, sondern musste von Ewigkeit her der Gegenstand der göttlichen Liebe gewesen sein.' Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 314, 315 ; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 504 ; on the same passage.

[3] *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 311, 312 : 'Etait-ce une existence personnelle, ou simplement idéale ? L'Apôtre ne s'explique pas suffisamment sur ce point.'

[4] See p. 311, and the whole passage.

if not impossible, to attribute a separate personal pre-existence.[1]

So, too, Beyschlag attempted to show that Paul ascribes to Christ only an ideal, and an impersonal pre-existence, and that He pre-existed, not as an actual personality, but only as the principle of one ('Die Christologie des N. T.' p. 243). But, in the first place, it may be noted that Steck, in reviewing modern criticism with regard to this point, not only describes Beyschlag's interpretation of such a passage as Phil. ii. 5, in which the latter finds no reference to the pre-existence of Christ, as a mere piece of fancy,[2] but that he also considers it more intelligible to understand 1 Cor. x. 4, not merely as referring to the pre-existence of a redemptive principle in the Old Covenant, but to a *personal pre-existent* Christ, actively engaged in the deliverance of Israel.[3] But we are by no means dependent upon such a disputed text as 1 Cor. x. 4, although it may be doubted whether it is sufficiently considered how many writers regard the words, not as figurative, but as indicating the actual pre-existence of Christ:[4] there are other passages in which St. Paul attributes to Christ the actions, not of a pre-existent principle, but of a pre-existent *person*. A mere pre-existent principle could not be represented as a moral example, as capable of a self-renunciation, of a self-emptying, such as that described in 2 Cor. viii. 9, or

[1] With this compare the criticism of Weiss: 'Auch Sabatier hält die Frage für unlösbar, ob Paulus die Präexistenz Christi als eine ideale oder persönliche gedacht habe, und behauptet fälschlich, die vorgeschichtliche Wirksamkeit Christi zerfliesse dem Apostel in die des göttlichen Geistes' (*B. T.* p. 297, note 7).

[2] Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 276, 277. Comp. his criticism of De Wette on 2 Cor. viii. 9.

[3] *Ibid.* p. 279.

[4] Comp. *e.g.* Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 125; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 42. So Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 298, and note, in answer to Baur and Schenkel, who interpret 1 Cor. x. 4 as typical (Schenkel, *Das Christusbild*, p. 259, and Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 267); Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 414; Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 318; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 505; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 28; Gess, *ubi supra*, p. 124; Kühl on 1 Pet. i. 11 in Meyer's *Kommentar*, p. 94, 5. Aufl.

So also Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 215; Steck, *ubi supra*, and von Soden in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, p. 490, 1883; Martineau, *Seat of Authority*, p. 393; Gore, *ubi supra*, p. 59.

in the closely parallel passage Phil. ii. 5, 6.[1] In both cases it may be fairly maintained that the force of the Greek, and the context point not only to the pre-existence of Christ, but to an act of free will on His part, to a moral act of self-denial, which could only be attributed to a personal being.[2] It is impossible to evade the force of the aorist ἐπτώχευσε in the former passage, which implies not only a state of poverty, but a definite time when Christ 'became poor,'[3] and it is easy to understand how the exhortation to charity in the one case (2 Cor. viii. 9), and to humility in the other (Phil. ii. 6), would be emphasised by the contrast between Christ's earthly poverty and humiliation and His pre-existent heavenly riches and glory.

Nor must we forget, in this connection, the strong critical testimony which, as we have seen, interprets 1 Cor. viii. 6 in such a manner as to assign to Christ a divine and *personal* agency in the creation of the world,[4] although, strangely enough, at least one recent authority, while adopting the strained interpretation of this passage, to which reference has already been made, can yet find, not only in Phil. ii. 6, 7, but even in 1 Cor. x. 4, proofs of Christ's *personal* and *pre-existent* agency.[5]

[1] See Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 316–320, 325, 327, 328; Weiss, *B. T.* pp. 297 and 426.

See also Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 217.

[2] It is to be noticed that although Sabatier in the passage above quoted does not regard ἐπτώχευσε as equivalent to ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν with Lechler, he yet sees in the latter expression a *moral act* by which Christ renounces His pre-existent Divine nature, and gives up His personal will to the will of the Father (*ubi supra*, p. 237). He also sees in Phil. ii. 5, 6, a natural development of the idea indicated in the former Epistle, 2 Cor. viii. 9. See p. 235.

[3] This is pointed out not only by Lechler (*ubi supra*, p. 317), but admitted in the plainest terms by Sabatier (234): 'On a souvent méconnu l'exacte portée de ce dernier texte. Sans doute, le mot ἐπτώχευσεν n'est pas l'équivalent de ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν. Le verbe πτωχεύειν signifie bien vivre pauvre, *paupertatem gerere*; mais l'aoriste indique ici très certainement le moment où cet état a commencé, où Christ est devenu pauvre.'

[4] See p. 260, and comp. also for authorities Lechler, *ubi supra*, p. 319, note 2, and Schmid, *B. T.* especially pp. 511, 512, in which he shows that St. Paul represents Christ not only as a truly divine principle, but also as a pre-existent principle, which is in itself a personal one.

[5] Thus Dr. Martineau, after remarking that some words are found in St. Paul's writings which seem to assign Christ even an instrumentality in the

But if St. Paul thus speaks of Christ as a pre-existent and personal being, there is no reason to suppose that such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 45–47 exhaust the Apostle's conception of this personality. This passage in 1 Corinthians is fixed upon by many critics as if it was the central point of the Pauline theology,[1] and the expressions 'the heavenly man,' 'the spiritual man,' 'the archetypal man,' are employed as if St. Paul had never given any intimation that Christ was to be described by any higher name, and as if nothing was easier than to refer the Apostle's use of such terms to Jewish or Hellenistic influences. But the points of contact with Jewish or other systems are more than counterbalanced by the points

creation of the world (1 Cor. viii. 6), would refer the 'all things' in this passage, not to the objects constituting the universe, but to the current Providential courses of human affairs, a view which he considers is amply justified by the context (*Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 393. See against this and similar views Schmid, *B. T.* especially pp. 495, 496, and comp. Lechler, *ubi supra*, as against Holsten, and Weiss, *B. T.* 297, note, as against Schenkel; comp. also Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 278: 'Dass Christus dann in seiner vormenschlichen Existenz weiter hinaufreicht also Dasein der Welt, und dass er das Organ der Weltschöpfung war, wird man aus dem oben angeführten Worte des ersten Korintherbriefes δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα auch nur schwer hinwegdeuten.') 'It would not have been in character,' continues Dr. Martineau (p. 394), 'for the Apostle as a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" to trench upon the undivided prerogative of Him who *alone* stretched out the heavens (Job ix. 8)'—a very two-edged argument, since Paul's antecedents make it all the more strange that he should so often seem to do so—'but,' he adds, 'the subordinate agency attributed to the pre-existent Christ in the national history and in the voluntary descent into the humiliations of mortal life, can belong only to a being conceived as *personal*, and therefore forbids us to interpret that personality as due to the incarnation and limited to the contents of the human nature.'

On the intense revulsion of the Jews from idolatry see some important remarks in Dr. Kennedy's *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, pp. 302 ff., who draws a very different argument from this fact from that maintained by Dr. Martineau.

[1] 'Auf diese Stelle gründet sich die Annahme, in welcher man neuerdings vielfach den eigentlichen Schlüssel zu der paulinischen Christologie gefunden zu haben glaubt' (Weiss, *B. T.* p. 295). So, too, Lechler points out how Holsten (*Das Ev. des Paulus*, i. 431 and 435), Pfleiderer (*Paulinismus*, 131; cf. *Urchristenthum*, p. 213), and others, imitating the example of Baur (*Paulus*, ii. 208), have ascribed to Paul the strange Gnostic and Docetic representation that Christ, in His prehistoric being, was the archetypal man existing in a spiritual body of light, a view which is based by these critics upon 1 Cor. xv. 47. Lechler, *ubi supra*, pp. 335, 336, and comp. Pfleiderer's *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 56–59; Keim's *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. pp. 624, 625; Hausrath's *Neutest. Zeit.* Bd. iii. pp. 91, 92.

of contrast.[1] If, *e.g.*, we examine the doctrine of the Adam Qadmon, or First Man, of the Jewish Talmud and Kabbalah, we see that it is not only very far removed from the doctrine of the Incarnation, but that in some of its forms it would be repulsive to the whole character of Christianity ;[2] and if we turn to the 'heavenly' man of Philo we see that, although he interprets Gen. i. 27 of the creation of this 'heavenly' man in contrast to Gen. ii. 8, which he refers to the 'earthly' man, we are not only still very far from the doctrine of the Incarnation, but that this archetype is not an individual at all, but a species, and, like the Adam Qadmon, neither male nor female.[3]

[1] Thus Schanz (*Apologie des Christenthums*), while admitting the Jewish ideas and representations may have influenced Paul's conception of 'the heavenly man': 'Es mag sein, dass Paulus zu dieser Auffassung des himmlischen Christus durch die Erscheinung des verklärten Christus vor Damaskus veranlasst wurde, ja dass er auch von der weit verbreiteten jüdischen Vorstellung von der himmlischen Welt, in welcher der Messias und die Güte des messianischen Reiches vorausgeschaffen sind und nur der Enthüllung harren, beeinflusst war ; aber einerseits ist es unbestreitbar, dass auch im Alten Testamente eine vorweltliche Zeugung angedeutet und namentlich in den LXX hervorgehoben ist, andererseits genügt eine Vergleichung mit Philo um den himmelweiten Unterschied kennen zu lernen. Nicht der Vorbereitung des Messias und Erlösers, nicht der Logos-Messias, nein, die Ueberführung des Logos in einen andern Stand, die Menschwerdung ist das wesentliche Unterscheidungsmerkmal' (*Gott und die Offenbarung*, pp. 414, 415 ; see also esp. pp. 178, 194). Comp. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, esp. p. 310, and an interesting *résumé* of a paper read by M. Henri Bois of Montauban, before the 'Conférences Évangeliques du Midi,' on 'La Préexistence de Jesus-Christ,' contained in *Le Christianisme au XIXe Siècle*, 5 décembre, 1889.

[2] Dorner, *Person Christi*, i. ('Einleitung'), 59, 60.

[3] See an admirable review of the views held by Holsten, and by the earlier Tübingen school, as to this passage in Godet's *Corinthians in loco*, vol. ii. E. T. pp. 418, 421, and article 'Philo' in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. iv. pp. 376, 381. See, too, Weiss's important criticism: 'Paulus soll auf Grund der Deutung, welche Philo dem doppelten Bericht über die Menschenschöpfung in der Genesis giebt, in Christo den himmlischen Urmenschen oder das Urbild der Menschheit aus Gen. i. gesehen haben, während hier ausdrücklich Christus der letzte Adam und der zweite Mensch heisst (1 Cor. xv. 45, 47),' *B. T.* p. 295, 5. Aufl.

Still more difficult is it in his view to connect Paul's statements with the Logos of Philo, for he immediately adds : 'Noch ferner aber liegt dem paulinischen Vorstellungskreise der Gedanke an den philonischen Logos, den Aeltere in dem paulinischen Christus erschienen sein liessen (vgl. Usteri, Dähne). Für die aprioristische Annahme eines solchen Mittelwesens findet sich in ihm auch nicht der geringste Anknüpfungspunkt.'

But if the Pauline Epistles thus express the highest Christology on the one hand, whilst on the other they insist no less plainly than the Gospels upon the lowly life and true humanity of Jesus, we may refuse to admit that St. Paul taught the doctrine of the Incarnation, but in so doing we only substitute one difficulty for another.[1]

No one has examined more fully than Keim the narratives of the birth of Jesus and the evidence upon which the words of the Apostles' Creed are based, 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary'[2]—he dismisses without hesitation the accounts of the Incarnation in St. Matthew and St. Luke as late additions to the primitive Jewish Gospel ;[3] he declares that the silence of St. John and St. Paul proves conclusively that they knew nothing of a divine nativity,[4] a story which he derives from the imagination which surrounds the entrance of great men into the world with poetry and legend,[5] whilst at times he falls back upon the Old Testament stories of the miraculous birth of an Isaac or a Samson ;[6] he affirms that St. Paul's conception of Jesus as the heavenly man which the Apostle undoubtedly entertained some twenty years after the Crucifixion, was based, not upon any historical tradition, but only upon the Apostle's personal and dogmatic consciousness.[7] And yet, when he has to express his own

[1] See this point brought out with reference to Keim, and also Sabatier, by Godet, *ubi supra*, p. 491.

Cf. also Didon, *Jésus-Christ*, i. 74, 75, on the strictures of Reuss, *Histoire Evangélique*, and of Sabatier, *Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses*, art. 'Jésus-Christ.'

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 336–412.

[3] *Ibid.* i. 342, 343.

[4] *Ibid.* i. 342, 346. On the silence of the Fourth Gospel see Salmon, *Introd. to the N. T.* pp. 276 ff. 5th edit.

[5] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 336, 337.

[6] *Ibid.* i. 354.

[7] Keim twice lays stress upon this short interval of thirty years ; cf. *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 345 and 347 : 'Allerdings reicht die Ansicht des Apostels Paulus bis auf das Jahr 20 nach Jesu Hingang zurück ; aber sie ist lediglich das Resultat seines dogmatischen Denkens, keineswegs einer vorgefundenen Ueberlieferung. Wenn er von geschichtlichen Traditionen der jerusalemischen Gemeinde redet, so hat er gewiss immer nur Tod und Auferstehung, niemals die Vorzeitlichkeit Jesu auf diesem Weg bewiesen. Wir haben auch keine Spur, dass in den Kreisen der ersten Apostel, Petrus, Jakobus, Johannes, dem Paulus diese Tradition präsentirt werden konnte' (pp. 347, 348).

It is further to be noticed that Keim carries back this belief in the heavenly

conception of the personality of Jesus he can find nothing more suitable for his purpose than the language of St. Paul: in Jesus a higher human organisation has entered into being by the creative will of God, and if 'it must have a name, it can bear no better one than that which Paul found for it in the very beginning: a new creation in humanity, a consummation, a desensualisation, a spiritualisation, a deification of the divine image.'[1]

Nay, he goes even further, and acknowledges that we should still not do full justice to the greatness of Jesus unless we distinguished this creative act of God in His person as ultimately *different in kind* from every other, as unique and specific.[2] Certainly it may well seem strange that a writer who admits so much should yet refuse to entertain the narratives which purport to give an account of what is, on his own showing, a supernatural birth.[3]

But whilst Keim more than once lays stress upon the fact that St. Paul's lofty conceptions of the Person of Jesus were

pre-existence of Jesus to the earliest Pauline letters, and not only (as he himself points out), like the school of Tübingen, to the later letters to the Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians. 'Among the Pauline letters that to the Galatians contains already the elements of the subsequent theory of the Corinthian letters' (*ubi supra*, p. 344 and note).

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 357, 358. 'Soll sie ihren Namen haben' (that is, the higher human organisation in the person of Jesus), 'so kann sie keinen besseren führen, als jenen, welchen gleich Anfangs Paulus gefunden: eine Neuschöpfung in der Menschheit, eine Vollendung, Entsinnlichung, Vergeistigung, Vergottung des göttlichen Ebenbilds' (p. 358).

[2] Und doch würden wir der Grösse Jesu immer noch nicht gerecht, wenn wir das schöpferische Handeln Gottes in seiner Person nicht seiner Energie und insofern schliesslich auch seinem Wesen nach von jedem andern schöpferischen Handeln Gottes unterscheiden, insofern als ein *einzigartiges* und *spezifisches* setzen würden' (Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 359).

[3] It is not surprising that, after referring to the passage above quoted from Keim, Godet should add: 'Mais s'il en est comme le dit cet écrivain, pourquoi, possédant un récit clair, positif, détaillé du fait qui est à la base d'une telle vie, aller en chercher l'explication dans le domain imaginaire et nébuleux de l'hypothèse? A nos yeux la naissance surnaturelle de Christ est juste aussi certaine, comme cause, que sa sainteté parfaite l'est comme effet' (*Saint Luc*, i. 216, 3rd edit. 1888). The fact that the supernatural birth is not mentioned outside the Gospels only proves, in Nösgen's view, that the belief in the divine Sonship of Christ was firmly established apart from it; and so, he argues, there was no motive for the construction of a mythical narrative of the birth of Jesus (*Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 114, 1891).

formed within the short period of twenty years after the Crucifixion, a circumstance in which he sees an undoubted proof of the marvellous impression which the life of Jesus had produced,[1] and whilst no one has given a higher summary of these conceptions than Keim himself,[2] it is evident that, like other writers of the same school, he does not recognise what Paul's Christology involves, and it is a poor solution of a difficulty to say that Paul, and the fourth Gospel, and the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, passed over pretty rapidly any delicate questions which might arise as to the human origin of the God-born Son, by means of an Incarnation.[3]

But whoever may have been, in Keim's opinion, the author of the fourth Gospel, or whatever doubts may surround the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul at any rate was a Jew, and at the same time a firm believer in the superhuman origin of Jesus and in the doctrine of the sending of the Eternal Son of God in flesh. Not only is it a question how far a strict monotheist like Paul could have assigned such names and attributes to Jesus as even Keim admits, with any due reverence for the sovereign majesty of Jehovah,[4] but it is not too much to add that the doctrine of the Incarnation, whether Paul was acquainted with its details or not, could have arisen anywhere more easily than where

[1] After giving a summary of these conceptions, Keim adds in his *Geschichte Jesu* (dritte Bearbeitung), 1875: 'Mag in diesen letzteren Aufstellungen weniger eine Geschichte als eine Gedankenwelt über die Geschichte zu greifen sein, diese Ahnungswelt des berufensten Zeugen, sowenig als irrthumlos ist, *spricht selbst für die Grösse des Lebens, welches nach einer Spanne von Zeit den Geistern der Menschen so sich verklären konnte*' (p. 21).

[2] '*Der Apostel Paulus betrachtet am Schluss der fünfzigen Jahre, sagen wir kurz, schon zwanzig Jahre nach dem Hingang Jesu*, diesen als den Führer der zweiten Menschheitsreihe, als den himmlischen und vom Himmel gekommenen verklärten Menschen nach der ersten adamitischen, irdischen, grobsinnlichen Menschheitsreihe, darum nicht blos als einen Menschen, *sondern als einen Gott zur Seite stehenden Herrn, als Ebenbild Gottes, als den eigenen Sohn, durch welchen alle Dinge geschaffen werden, welcher als geistiger Fels Israel segnend durch die Wüste begleitet hat*' (*Geschichte Jesu*, i. 345).

[3] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 346; see also Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 58.

[4] Cf. *e.g.* Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 509, and a remarkable passage in W. F. Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 304, 305, 1887, upon the deeply rooted Monotheism of the first disciples, and its relation to their Christology. See above, p. 262.

Keim himself points out that it did arise—viz. upon Jewish-Christian soil.[1]

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 342.

'The Hindoo mind,' says Neander, himself a Jewish convert, 'might have originated a fable of this character, though in a different form from that in which the account of the Evangelists is given; but the Jewish had totally different tendencies. Such a fable as the birth of the Messiah from a *virgin* could have arisen anywhere else easier than among the Jews; their doctrine of the Divine Unity, which placed an impassable gulf between GOD and the world; their high regard for the marriage relation, which led them to abhor unwedded life; and, above all, their full persuasion that the Messiah was to be an ordinary man, undistinguished by anything supernatural, and not to be endued with Divine power before the time of his solemn consecration, all conspired to render such an invention impossible among them.' And he adds: 'It was on this very account, viz. because the miraculous conception was foreign to the prevailing Jewish modes of thought, that one sect of the Ebionites, who could not free themselves from their old prejudices, refused to admit the doctrine; and the section which contains the account is excluded from the Ebionitish recension of the Gospel to the Hebrews, which arose from the same source as our Matthew' (*Life of Christ*, E. T. pp. 17, 18). Comp. with Neander's remarks Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 220, who also emphasises the argument that against every attempt to derive the idea of the supernatural generation of Jesus from Jewish Christian views we must place the fact that it was just in such circles that the only opposition to it is found, viz. in its rejection by the Ebionites. So, too, Didon, *Jésus-Christ*, i. 71, and comp. Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 114, 1891.

It is further to be noticed that Keim allows that there is no trace of a miraculous birth of the Messiah in the older writings of the Jews, nor even in Jewish expectations at the time of Jesus; even as late as the time of Justin Martyr, the Messiah is for the Jews ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων (*Tryph.* 49; *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 355). If it is alleged that the belief in the miraculous conception, and the Gospel story of the Incarnation, were derived from Old Testament prophecies, it is to be remembered that Keim admits that Isaiah vii. 14 is open to several different interpretations (*ubi supra*, pp. 354, 355). Weiss, in his *Leben Jesu*, i. 219, points out that there is no proof that this passage was ever supposed in the pre-Christian period to refer to the Messiah, or that the Jews regarded it as pointing to a virgin mother, as the Hebrew expression by no means exclusively indicated an unmarried person (cf. Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 34); and if the prophecy of Micah v. 2, is relied upon as proving beyond a doubt that the Old Testament pointed to Bethlehem as the birthplace of the Messiah (Keim, *ubi supra*, p. 355; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 181), yet even then we are very far from accounting for the circumstances narrated in the Gospels—a census, *e.g.*, and that census taken at the bidding of a heathen emperor, and executed by a Herod, would represent, as Edersheim expresses it, the *ne plus ultra* of all that was most repugnant to Jewish feeling.

Speaking of the prophecy in Isaiah vii. 14, Steinmeyer, in his important work *Geschichte der Geburt des Herrn*, writes (p. 95): 'Die Beziehung derselben auf den Messias datirt nemlich erst von dem Matthäus. Sie hat sich von da ab allerdings durch alle Jahrhunderte, bis tief in das achzehnte herab, einer unbestrittenen Geltung erfreut; aber sie hat eben ausschliesslich auf der Autorität des Evangelisten beruht, und es fehlt an jedweder Spur, dass sich früher die

In support of his statement, Keim refers to St. Paul's depreciatory views of marriage, as one of the sources of the belief in the birth from a Virgin Mother, although he hesitates to affirm that any such views can be found in the teaching of Jesus.[1] We are, moreover, asked to believe that this lovely and attractive legend formed itself 'naturally' and 'irresistibly' around the birth of Jesus. In times and among minds where science is not a power, the pureness and elevation of a great teacher, it is said, powerfully strike the popular imagination, and the natural, simple, reverential explanation of His superiority is at once that He was born of a virgin. Such a legend is the people's genuine translation for the fact of His unique pureness.[2] But it ought surely to be remembered that we have not to deal with some later ascetic age of the Christian Church, to which the idea of the superiority of the virgin condition had become familiar; but with the Jewish nation—a nation amongst whom marriage was held in the highest possible honour, exalted almost to the dignity of a Christian sacrament, and actually considered to carry with it the for-

Hoffnung Israels mit diesem prophetischen Ausspruch geeinigt hätte. Aber wie kann sich dann, so müssen wir fragen, die angebliche Sage aus einer Stelle herausgebildet haben, welche von Niemanden in solch' einem Sinne verstanden worden war?'

But if the story of the Incarnation could not have arisen on Jewish grounds, it must have had its origin in Gentile sources. And if so, we must face the difficulty as to how anything from such a quarter could find such ready acceptance in Christian circles; if it is alleged, *e.g.*, that the mythological conception of sons of the gods and of heroes gave rise to the belief in the divine conception of Jesus, it is surely not too much to say that the primitive Christian consciousness would have felt the deepest abhorrence of the shameless glorifying of sensual desire in these pagan myths, and the application of any such idea to Jesus must have appeared nothing less than the most shocking profanation. See, *e.g.*, Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 220, and Neander, *Life of Christ*, E. T. pp. 15, 16, and note, and, more recently, Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 110, 1891. The newly discovered *Apology of Aristides*, whilst it asserts most plainly the birth of the Son of God 'from a Hebrew virgin,' emphasises the horror with which the Christians regarded the legends of the pagan gods and goddesses. See *e.g.*, pp. 30, 83, 93, ff., in the recent account of the *Apology* by Mrs. Rendel Harris.

No one has pointed out more forcibly than Keim the great difference between Philo's theories of the Eternal Divine Word, and the Christian conception of the Incarnation (*ubi supra*, p. 356).

[1] *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. i. 354.

[2] See, *e.g.*, Mr. Matthew Arnold's 'A Comment on Christmas,' reprinted in his *Paul and Protestantism*.

giveness of sins.[1] Why, then, if they wanted to find 'a symbol of purity,' should Jewish Christians either 'naturally' or 'irresistibly' seek it in the story of the birth from a Virgin Mother? It is therefore nothing to the point to refer such a story to Grecian or Roman sources for its origin, or to insist dogmatically upon the fact that a similar story of a miraculous birth gathered around the name of Plato.[2] It is quite impossible, in the opinion of the German writer Karl Steinhart, that any such story was known in the days of Speusippus, Plato's nephew: Diogenes Laertius, who refers it to him, never distinguishes between truth and fiction in his account of the life of Plato, and evidently there is some confusion in his statement that the story was known to Speusippus.[3] Steinhart

[1] Weiss, after referring to the supposition that the thought of the miraculous conception had its origin in the idea of impurity attaching even to the sexual relationship in marriage, or to the idea of the higher purity of the virgin condition, adds: 'These views, however, of later ascetic tendencies, although they certainly gained currency in Christendom, are yet, in an acknowledged degree, far removed from the view of Judaism, which considered marriage as a divine institution, and the fruit of the body as a blessing from God' (*Leben Jesu*, i. 219, 220). For Jewish views as to the dignity of marriage, see Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 352, 353.

It may not be out of place to compare with the remarks of Weiss and Neander (*ubi supra*) the opinion of Dean Milman in his *History of Christianity*, i. 99: 'I am inclined to think that the Jews, though partially orientalised in their opinions, were the people among whom such a notion was least likely to originate of itself [viz. the birth from a virgin]. Marriage, by the mass of the people, was considered in a holy light; and there are traces that the hopes of becoming the mother of the Messiah was one of the blessings which, in their opinion, belonged to marriage.' See also, in this connection, the criticism of Didon to the same effect: 'Rien qui rappelle les fables païennes de l'intervention suspecte des dieux et des déesses dans l'avènement des héros ou des grands hommes; *rien qui dénote le génie juif, si peu ouvert à l'idéal de la virginité.* Le récit de l'origine virginale de Jésus ne s'explique que par la réalité même; ce n'est pas ainsi que l'imagination rêve et invente' (*Jésus-Christ*, i. 72); and Dean Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom* (Boyle Lectures), pp. 363–365, new edit. 1886.

[2] See, for example, amongst recent English writers, Mr. Matthew Arnold, *ubi supra*, and Professor Estlin Carpenter, *The Synoptic Gospels*, p. 153. It is by no means certain that Diogenes Laertius is worthy of such implicit confidence as Professor Carpenter asserts; see below, reference to Steinhart's *Platon's Leben* (Leipzig, 1873).

[3] Steinhart's opinion of Diogenes' *Life of Plato* may be gained by consulting the following paragraph: 'Sein *Leben Platon's* führt uns durch ein Feld voll wüst durcheinander liegender Trümmer von Trümmern. Ueberall stellt er mit grosser

points out that had the story entirely depended upon Olympiodorus, who tried to revive Neo-Platonism in the sixth century, it might have been that the story of Christ's wonderful birth had been transferred by him to Plato, but since this theory would not apply to Apuleius or Plutarch, or to the statement of Diogenes Laertius with reference to pre-Christian times, we must seek for the origin of the story in the eagerness with which in the *Grecian* world hero-worship gathered around great names, and in the myths associated with the birth of Alexander the Great.[1]

Naivetät die echte und die gefälschte Darstellung, Mythos und Geschichte, Ueberlieferung und willkürliche Erdichtung, Lob und Tadel, Vergötterung und Verleumdung des Philosophen, fast ohne eigenes Urtheil dicht nebeneinander, und obgleich er für beides Quellen anführt, die er indessen häufig gar nicht gelesen, sondern seinen Vorgängern nachcitirt zu haben scheint, so unterlässt er doch vielfach gerade bei den wichtigsten Angaben die Bezeichnung seiner Quellen' (*Platon's Leben*, p. 26 ; cf. p. 262).

Steinhart's positive conclusion as to the improbability that the fable of Plato's birth was known to Speusippus is given on p. 36 of his *Platon's Leben* : 'Dass indessen schon Speusippos dieser Fabel als einer zu seiner Zeit umlaufenden gedacht habe, wie Diogenes angibt, ist unglaublich und kann, wie wir bereits erwähnten, nur auf einem Misverständniss beruhen.' See for Steinhart's account of this misunderstanding pp. 7, 8, and 260 of his *Platon's Leben*.

[1] Steinhart, *ubi supra*, p. 36, and comp. p. 282, note 30. 'Immerhin ist es bemerkenswerth, dass über die grossen Staatsmänner Themistokles, Aristeides, Perikles nichts der Art gefabelt wurde, sondern erst mit dem phantastischen Alexander, der sich den homerischen Heroen zuzugesellen liebte, die alten Heroensagen wieder auftauchen ; da ist es immerhin möglich, dass man in Athens schon bald nach Alexander's Tode, *gewiss aber lange nach Speusippos*, den Platon durch jene Fabel als Geistesheros dem vergötterten Weltüberwinder ebenbürtig zur Seite stellen wollte.'

Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, p. 96, remarks that the attempt of Strauss to explain the story of the Incarnation from heathen sources is not a whit more fortunate than the attempt to derive it from Jewish prophecy : 'Ganz abgesehen von den Rücksichten der Pietät erschien es denn doch allzu gewaltsam, so heterogene Dinge in Parallele mit einander zu stellen. Den Erfolg, der ihm auf diesem Wege erreichbar war, hat sich Strauss übrigens dadurch selbst abgeschnitten, dass er von dem eigentlich mythologischen Gebiete Abstand nimmt, und statt dessen auf der Thatsache beruft, dass Männer wie Plato, Alexander, Augustus von ihren Verehren als Göttersöhne betrachtet worden seyen. Dass die "Sage" von der Menschwerdung des Sohnes Gottes in der Analogie derartiger Apotheosen entstanden sey, das wird er selbst dem Schwachsinn nicht einreden können.' In a note Steinmeyer points out that in a later work, *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, Strauss again appears to fall back simply upon mythology : 'Wir wittern mythologische Luft ; nur dass uns die griechischen Götterzeugungen besser erfunden dünken als diese christliche' (Strauss, *Der alte und der neue Glaube*, p. 25).

No doubt the early Christian Apologists saw in these pagan myths of supernatural births prototypes and anticipations of the Incarnation, and it must always be remembered that they started with presupposing that event, but this is a very different thing from explaining the origin of the idea of it.[1]

But whilst, in the passages we have examined, Christ is represented as a pre-existent and divine being, joint agent with God in the creation of the world, so that even if St. Paul does not directly call Him God,[2] he approaches so closely to the conception of the Logos that only the word used by St. John seems wanting;[3] and whilst, by His Incarnation, He takes upon Him the form of a servant, a conception strictly in accordance with the Gospel narratives of His lowly birth

[1] Comp. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 220, 221, and the fuller remarks of Neander, *Life of Christ*, E. T. p. 16, note.

It really seems almost needless to answer the criticism which finds an argument against the historic truth of the Christian Incarnation in the Birth Stories of the Buddha (Prof. Estlin Carpenter, *ubi supra*, p. 155). The best answer to such attacks may be found in the weighty statements of Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, pp. 33, 34, to say nothing of Dr. Kellogg's chapter entitled 'The Comparative Value of the Buddhist and the Christian Scriptures' in his *Light of Asia*, &c. pp. 19–55, and Dr. Kennedy's *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, pp. 313, 314. The remarks of Didon are also of interest, though from a very different point of view, in his *Jésus-Christ*, i. 74. It is not wise, in defending the Incarnation, to attach too much importance to instances of what is called *parthenogenesis* in the natural world (see Sir W. Dawson's remarks in his *Modern Ideas of Evolution*, p. 39).

[2] Steck emphatically defends the reference of Rom. ix. 5 to Christ, and his full discussion of the passage is important, as it is a further proof that there is nothing grammatical in the way of such an interpretation, although no doubt Steck is influenced by his desire to place the *Hauptbriefe* as late as possible (*ubi supra*, pp. 284–287). Comp. also in favour of a like reference to Christ the critical remarks of Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 413, and Godet's review of the various interpretations of the passage, *L'Epître aux Romains*, pp. 250 f. 2nd edit.; Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 331, 332; also Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 513; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 282, and note, 5. Aufl.; Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 55, and note; but comp. *Urchristenthum*, p. 240, note Ritschl undoubtedly refers the words to Christ (*Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, p. 79, 2. Aufl.)

But see on the other side, Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 260, 264, and amongst recent commentators, Lipsius in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 145.

[3] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, esp. pp. 217, 238; Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 95.

and life, the expression of the Apostle 'the second Adam' may remind us that we are again on the lines of the Synoptist Gospels. It is not only that St. Luke in his genealogy (ch. iii.) virtually represents our Lord as 'the second Adam' (in contrast with St. Matthew, who represents Him as the heir of Abraham), a conception entirely in accordance with St. Paul's declaration of universal redemption and brotherhood in Christ;[1] but it is not too much to add that St. Paul's description of the work of 'the second Adam' is strikingly in harmony with that of 'the Son of Man' in the Gospel records.[2] Thus in Matt. xx. 28 Christ Himself speaks of the life of the Son of Man as a life of service, and of His death as a work of redemption, in this way uniting, as it were, in one breath the two conceptions of the life and death of Jesus which are found side by side in the Epistles (cf. Phil. ii. 4–8;

[1] Comp. *e.g.* Schmid, *ubi supra*, pp. 35, 553.

[2] Hausrath lays stress upon the fact that Jesus never called Himself 'the second Adam,' and that all such representations of Him had their origin, not in the teaching of Jesus, but in the anthropology of Paul (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 72). But whilst it is true that our Lord never spoke of Himself as 'the second Adam,' it may be fairly said that such a conception is contained in His teaching about Himself.

'Kann man den Gedanken von Jesu Bezeichnung seiner selbst als des Sohnes des Menschen geistvoller auslegen als es Paulus in seiner zweimaligen Gegenüberstellung des zweiten und des ersten Adam thut?' (Gess, *ubi supra*, *Das apostolische Zeugniss*, p. 368).

In this same connection we may refer to the important note of Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 80: 'Dass erst in der paulinischen Christologie (namentlich 1 Cor. xv. 45 ff. 21; Röm. v.; Phil. ii. 7, 8) der höhere Begriff, welchen Jesus unstreitig mit dem Ausdruck Menschensohn verbaut, zur Entfaltung kommt, kann nicht zweifelhaft seyn, obwohl das Wort selbst bei Paulus nicht gebraucht wird. Der Hellenist Stephanus, sein Vorläufer, hatte den Ausdruck selbst noch gebraucht' (*Apostelgeschichte*, p. 56).

So, too, Dorner in discussing the title 'Son of Man' speaks of it as giving us the Christian version of the doctrine of the Adam Kadmon, which is specially unfolded in the Pauline doctrine of the second Adam, who completes the creation of the first, 1 Cor. xv. 45–47; Rom. v. 14 (*ubi supra*, p. 83). With these statements we may also compare Dr. Liddon's remark in *The Inspiration of Selection*, Sermon preached at Oxford on Whitsunday, 1890: 'A phrase of Jesus becomes in the hands of an Apostle the warrant of a doctrine, which is thus seen to have been always latent in it. The title "Son of Man," for instance, reappears in St. Paul as "the second Adam," the ideal Representative of mankind, whose work is placed in vivid contrast with that of the first father of our race;' see also Dr. Kennedy's *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, pp. 148–154; and Dr. Fairbairn's *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 193, 5th edit.

Rom. v. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 9; Matt. viii. 20), using words to describe His own ministry of service and His own redeeming death which seem to have passed into habitual use in the language of the Apostles (cf. Luke xxii. 27; Rom. xv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 23, iii. 6; Phil. i. 1, &c.; and cf. also 1 Tim. ii. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 20; 1 Pet. i. 19), so that St. Paul in viewing the death of Jesus as the crowning point of His life and the consummation of His obedience was not expressing his own subjective fancies, but in reality the mind of Christ (Matt. xx. 28; Luke xxii. 27; Mark x. 38; John xii. 27).[1]

It is also to be noted that whilst, in St. Paul's conception, Jesus is the representative of humanity (Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 22), so also does his work extend to each individual man who comes under his consideration, not as Jew or Gentile, but simply as a human being and a sinner, who can appropriate the Person and the work of Jesus as if they existed for himself alone (Gal. ii. 20; Rom. xiv. 15, &c.). We may

[1] 'Er war unter den Menschen wie ein Diener, wie denn Christus selbst (Luk. xxii. 27), diess von sich sagt, und (Matt. xx. 28) sein ganzes Leben als eine Diakonie beschreibt, auch—wir könnten mit Verkehrung der Sachordnung sagen ächt paulinisch—als den Gipfel dieser Diakonie, als das, worin der Gehalt und der Charakter seines Lebens am klarsten zu Tage komme, sein Selbsthingabe in den Tod bezeichnet. Obwohl dieser Tod ein Lösegeld für die Vielen sein sollte (Matt. xx. 28, xxvi. 28, und die auffallend ähnliche Stelle Röm. v. 19), so war doch die persönliche Wirksamkeit Jesu während seines Lebens nur auf das israelitische Volk beschränkt; er war ein Diener der Beschneidung (Röm. xv. 8, Matt. xv. 24).' Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 24.

With this passage in Paret we may connect Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 63: 'Jésus a borné son ministère au peuple d'Israël, il est resté, jusqu'au bout, le *serviteur de la circoncision* (Rom. xv. 8). *L'Apôtre Paul parle de Jésus, comme Jésus lui-même parle du fils de l'homme*; il a été pauvre, méconnu, humble, obéissant; il n'est pas venu pour être servi, mais pour servir; il a pris le rang et la forme d'un serviteur; servir et obéir a été toute sa vie (διακονία, ὑπακοή). And then he adds a criticism of Baur with which Paret's note above quoted (cf. p. 24, note 1) is closely in agreement: 'Il est parfaitement exact, comme l'a fait remarquer Baur, que Paul considère toute la vie du Sauveur à la lumière de sa mort, et voit dans cette mort le couronnement de son ministère et la consommation de son obéissance. Mais n'est-ce pas de ce même point de vue que Jésus considérait sa vie et son œuvre (Matt. xx. 28; Luc xxii. 27; Marc x. 38; Jean xii. 27)?' 'Im Sprachgebrauch des Apostels Paulus und der Evangelien haben die Worte διακονεῖν, διακονία, διάκονος eine sehr weite Bedeutung. Sie werden angewendet auf den Beruf Jesus, Röm. xv. 8 (Gal. ii. 17), Matt. xx. 28.' Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 634. Comp. also Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 216, and also Dean Plumptre in *Commentary on the N. T.* (Ellicott), i. 126.

of course regard this conception of the Christ idea as the natural result of the revelation made to the Apostle by the Risen One, appearing no longer as a Jew, but as the glorified Son of Man, and Son of God; but may we not also regard it, asks Paret, as proceeding from the historical Christ, who, although He has indeed limited His temporal circuit of work almost entirely to the people of Israel (cf. also Rom. xv. 8), yet, within the same, as Son of Man regarded men as such, as sinners in need of redemption, and while He gave to Himself and His work a meaning for all people (Matt. xxv. 32, xxviii. 19), yet equally comprehended the most insignificant individuality (Matt. xxv. 40, &c.), and especially those who no longer found a place, or at least no good one, in the Jewish national Church? If this be so, we see how Paul, in this fundamental point of his Christology, goes back to the historical Christ, and gives us a conception of Him identical with that which is furnished us by the Synoptists.[1]

No doubt it may be maintained that Philo's conception of the heavenly man, the ideal man, is based upon the Platonic world of ideas, and it is very easy to attribute to St. Paul 'unconscious Platonism'[2]; but the second Adam, the heavenly man of St. Paul, is identified with the historical Christ, and is neither a sexless being, like the ideal man of Philo, nor a being who has his dwelling in the world of pure forms, like the ideal man of Plato. Such a passage, *e.g.*, as Gal. iii. 28, indicates plainly enough how closely the Apostle approached to the thought of Christ as the representative head of humanity, a thought which expresses at least one meaning of the title 'Son of Man,' by which Jesus of Nazareth loved to express his relationship to the whole race of mankind:[3] and we are justified in maintaining that the Pauline

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 80, 81.

[2] For an elaborate exposition of the view that the Pauline conceptions were based upon those of Philo and Platonism, see Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. 88–95, the section entitled 'Der Messias als zweiter Adam,' esp. pp. 92, 93.

[3] For Hausrath's interpretation of this passage in conformity with his own views, see *ubi supra*, p. 93, and comp. also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 55, 5. Aufl.

terms 'the second Adam,' 'the heavenly man,' are derived directly from the special designation of Jesus, 'the Son of Man who came down from heaven,' and that there is no need to refer them to any other source.[1]

It must not of course be forgotten that the title 'Son of Man' has two sides, a human and a divine, and that it speaks even more for the heavenly than for the earthly man. Whether or not we interpret it, with Neander and others, of Jesus as the representative of humanity, it is plainly based upon Daniel vii. 13, an origin to which the words of Jesus before the high-priest refer us, and it is therefore a title which points to a heavenly Son of Man, who had come from heaven, where he had his pre-existent life.[2]

[1] 'Die ebionitische Idee des Adam-Christus ist, in ihrer formellen Berührung mit der Christologie des Paulus, derselben geradezu entgegengesetzt. Obgleich Paulus ebenfalls Christus als Adam bezeichnet (Röm. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45, 47) und seine Ausdrücke ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός und ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ den philonischen nahe stehen, so identificirt er beide doch nicht wieder, sondern stellt den Anfänger der Sünde und den Anfänger der Gerechtigkeit und des Lebens in Gegensatz. Und nur die Ignorirung der Sünde macht jenes juden-christliche Theologumenon möglich, welches die beabsichtigte Identität des Judenthums und Christenthums charakteristisch bezeichnet. Ferner ist die paulinische Terminologie nicht abhängig von der essenischen Ausbeutung der Stellen in der Genesis, sondern von der Jesu selbst eigenthümlichen Bezeichnung des υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς' (A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, note, p. 216, 2. Aufl. 1857).

Comp. also p. 81, where Ritschl also refers the Pauline titles of Christ, 'the heavenly man,' 'the image of God,' to the peculiar expression of Jesus in calling Himself 'the Son of Man.' Comp. also Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 412, who also, it is to be noticed, uses the same expression as Ritschl, 'der Menschensohn, der vom Himmel gekommen ist' (John iii. 13), 'the Son of Man who came from Heaven,' and attaches to it, in the mouth of Jesus, an ideal significance.

[2] See Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 410-414. (It is impossible to read these pages without noting the wide difference between Hase's interpretation of Jesus' announcement of His Messiahship, and the extraordinary assertion of Dr. Martineau that Jesus never claimed to be the Messiah. In the same connection we may well compare Hase's remarks, p. 414, with Dr. Martineau's refusal to allow that Jesus ever uttered the words 'Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will refresh you,' Matt. xi. 28. See also Harnack's emphatic rejection of the view entertained by Dr. Martineau and other critics, (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. 57.)

Comp. especially Schanz in his *Apologie des Christenthums: Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 408, 1888: 'Aber Jesus nennt sich selbst *Menschensohn*. Dieses Wort ist indess so weit entfernt für die pure menschliche Person als Argument zu dienen, dass es vielmehr entschieden darüber hinausweist. Der einzige Umstand, dass es auch dem Johannes sehr wohl bekannt ist, dürfte schon

At the same time it is remarkable that it forms a point of contact between the Christology of the first three Gospels and that of St. John, and there were other titles which the latter Evangelist might have chosen had he designed, as is so often asserted, to place the human nature of Jesus in the background.[1]

It is no doubt worthy of observation that the expression 'Son of Man' is not found in any of the Epistles, but this is fairly accounted for by the fact that the early Christians loved to think of Jesus as the glorified and ascended *Lord*:

zur Vorsicht mahnen. Der Titel spricht mehr für den himmlischen als für den irdischen Menschen. Er ist ein Bindeglied zwischen der Christologie der Synoptiker und der des Johannes. Denn ob man denselben von der Bedeutung Jesu für die Menschheit, für die menschliche Natur oder anders erkläre, jeder Erklärung ist Dan. vii. 13 zu Grunde zu legen, worauf Jesus vor dem Hohenpriester selbst hinweist. Der Titel geht also vom himmlischen Menschensohne aus, der vom Himmel gekommen ist, dort gelebt, präexistirt hat.'

The remarks of Neander, *Life of Jesus*, E. T. pp. 98, 99, may be compared with this passage (see also note 2). And on the following page Neander adds: 'We cannot find in Christ's use of the title any trace of the Alexandrian Theologoumenon of the archetype of humanity in the *Logos*, of *Philo's* distinction between the idea of humanity and its manifestation (or the Kabbalistic *Adam Kadmon*); notwithstanding it was not by accident that so many *ideal* elements, formed from a commingling of Judaism and Hellenism, were given as points of departure to the *realism* of Christianity; although this last was grounded on the highest fact in history.'

[1] Comp. Schanz, *ubi supra*, p. 408; Neander, *ubi supra*, p. 99, note.

Keim, in his lengthy discussion of the meaning of the title 'Son of Man' (*Geschichte Jesu*, ii. 64–76), points out how frequently this conception of the 'Son of Man' as the perfection, the ideal of humanity, the second Adam, has been entertained by modern writers (pp. 75, 76). Keim himself unhesitatingly refers the origin of the title to the Book of Daniel, although he thinks that Jesus was also influenced in His choice of the name by Psalm viii., a Psalm to which Keim finds frequent references in the Gospels as well as in the Epistles of the N. T. (p. 72 and note 1, for points of immediate contact with Dan. vii.). The title, as Keim insists, had two sides: a higher, in that one cannot dismiss it as a mere title of humility or of fellowship with the human race (as Dr. Martineau suggests), for in many passages far higher conceptions are undoubtedly connected with it (pp. 70, 71, and notes); and a lower side, a side which was manifested in lowliness and service (pp. 74, 75). In a remarkable passage (p. 76) Keim attempts to combine the two sides, the human and the divine; but it is to be noted that although he sees in Christ's choice of this title a claim to be the Messiah in a deep moral and spiritual sense, rather than in accordance with the gross Jewish ideal of lordship and dominion, and although he adds 'Seine Herrschaft lag in Wahrheit in seiner Dienstbarkeit,' he does not deny that such passages as Matt. xxv., which speak of the Son of Man as the future Judge on His throne, contain a claim which Jesus actually made (ii. 74, iii. 652).

indeed, the very absence of the term in question from the Epistles is an argument in favour of the primitive character of the narratives of the Gospels, inasmuch as they thus strikingly represent an earlier tone of feeling.[1]

It may further be observed that Keim insists upon the fact that whatever may be the precise date of the legends of the Incarnation, they must have been post-Apostolic, and above all, post-Pauline.[2] But if this is the case, it would seem, in the first place, that the theory which alleges that the belief in the sinlessness of Jesus gave birth in the primitive Christian consciousness to the story of His miraculous conception can no longer be maintained, since Paul, who distinctly affirms the former, never even refers, in Keim's opinion, to the latter.[3]

In the next place, Keim fails to take sufficient account of the fact, that the story of the Incarnation, in our Canonical Gospels, even if unknown to St. Paul, is very different from the description in the Apocryphal Gospels and in the products of the age to which Keim refers them.[4]

[1] 'Dieses Verhülltsein der übermenschlichen Majestät Jesu durch die Niedrigkeit irdischen Menschenwesens ist der Grund warum der Auferstandene sich nicht mehr diesen Namen gibt (auch Lukas xxiv. 7 erinnert nur an ein früheres Wort); jetzt war die Majestät unverhüllt. Ferner warum die Apostel ihn nicht mehr den Menschensohn nennen: an die Niedrigkeit seiner Erscheinung durch den Namen zu erinnern widerstritt ihrem Gefühl' (W. F. Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, erste Abtheilung, p. 187, 2. Aufl., and cf. zweite Abtheilung, p. 368). For the same argument see also Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 244, and an interesting note by Dean Plumptre in Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.* ii. 45, and Farrar's *Messages of the Books*, p. 31.

Keim, in commenting upon the fact that the title is so seldom found outside the Gospels, and never in the writings of St. Paul, adds: 'ein merkwürdiges Anzeichen gleichsosehr von der Selbstständigkeit der Entwicklungen apostolischer Zeit wie von der Unabhängigkeit der evangelischen Tradition gegenüber der nachfolgenden geschichtlichen Strömung' (*ubi supra*, p. 66; see also note 4 on same page).

[2] *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 342.

[3] Comp. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 221.

[4] For a detailed examination of the marvellous contrast between the canonical and Apocryphal Gospels, see Ullmann's *Historisch oder Mythisch?* pp. 162–212.

Keim seems himself conscious of the difference between the two sets of narratives; cf. *e.g. Geschichte Jesu*, i. 362, and p. 343, where he speaks of the 'chaste reserve' of Matthew.

See also Didon, in his chapter upon the historicity of the miraculous accounts of the birth and infancy of Jesus (*ubi supra*, pp. 71, 72).

This remarkable contrast between the Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels is not only emphasised by orthodox theologians who might be considered to exaggerate it; both Hase and Reuss insist upon it no less decidedly.[1] But many of these Apocryphal Gospels, with their insipid tales and fantastic miracles, date, according to the Tübingen theory, from the same period as our Canonical Gospels; how, then, are we to account for the contrast between them?[2] It is remarkable that these Apocryphal Gospels are most exuberant in their fancy during that period of our Lord's earthly life which preceded His public ministry—that is to say, just when our Canonical Gospels are silent:[3] these silly tales of our Lord's childhood and youth show us what to expect whenever we leave firm historical ground, and the fact that these Gospels have so embellished the period left almost void by our Evangelists goes far to prove that their writers must have been aware of the ground thus left open to them—in other words, that our Gospels must have been already in existence.[4] No wonder that Dr. Weiss remarks that there is no more striking apology for the Canonical Gospels than the contrast afforded by the Apocryphal, and that he should consider it a matter of congratulation that we in these latter still possess monuments of what free invention was able to produce when set loose from all tradition of eye-witnesses.[5] Here, then, is a fact which everyone may test for himself, an instance in early Church history of a remarkable survival of the fittest. Is this fact to be ascribed to chance—to the literary instinct of men who were, so we are assured, superstitious and ignorant to a degree? or is it another proof that

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 186; Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 298, 299, 1887, 6. Aufl.

[2] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. i. p. 162.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.* i. pp. 162–165.

[5] 'Es giebt keine augenfälligere Apologie für die Geschichtlichkeit unserer kanonischen Evangelien, als das Gegenbild dieser apokryphischen' (*ubi supra*, p. 164). 'Wir sind in der glücklichen Lage, noch Denkmäler zu besitzen, aus welchen wir ersehen können, was die von aller Ueberlieferung der Augenzeugen losgelöste freie Dichtung hervorzubringen vermochte, in den sogenannten apokryphischen Evangelien' (*ubi supra*, p. 162).

the gift of Pentecost enabled the Church of God 'to have a right judgment in all things'?[1]

[1] It is of interest to note that the reasons given by Dr. W. H. Mill (*Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, 1861) for the silence of the New Testament writers as to the details of the miraculous birth of our Lord, are substantially the same as those which commend themselves to the judgment of B. Weiss in his *Leben Jesu*. Comp. *e.g.* Mill, pp. 213, 214, 218, with Weiss, i. 217, 223, 224. Both writers point out that there is no reason whatever to assume that the miraculous conception of Jesus, if a fact, must have been generally acknowledged during His lifetime. On the contrary, there was a high and holy interest in guarding this secret of the house, to preclude not only all irreverent curiosity, but also calumnious falsehood, 'a falsehood which,' as Dr. Mill remarks, 'when that mystery became generally notorious as Christian doctrine, and not before, burst forth with the utmost virulence from the enemies of the Son of Mary.' On the origin of these stories see Mill, p. 200, note, and Weiss, i. 217, 224. See also Didon, *Jésus-Christ*, p. 71, and Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 368–370. The subject is so important that one or two arguments from Dr. Weiss, which afford a fitting parallel to the arguments of W. H. Mill, are given at length. After remarking upon the extraordinary nature of the demand that Jesus should point out His miraculous birth to the masses of the people, who, in spite of His daily miracles, did not believe on Him; and after adding that the unbelief of the brethren of Jesus, in spite of what they had heard of the divine revelations and miracles at His birth, is quite intelligible in view of the offensive contrast which the whole appearance of Jesus presented to their highly-wrought expectations, he proceeds to show how silence with regard to this secret, on the part of those who knew of it, was justified by the event: 'Wenn im Volke nirgends ein Zweifel daran aufgetaucht ist, dass Jesus der leibliche Sohn des Mannes war, in dessen Hause er aufgewachsen, wenn der Vorwurf unehelicher Geburt erst in viel späterer Zeit *und offenbar auf Grund unserer evangelischen Berichte im Munde der Feinde Jesu erscheint*, so ist das nur ein Beweis, dass man die Ehre dieses Hauses nicht preisgab, indem man jedem Ungläubigen einen Vorwand bot, Jesum als einen in Sünden und Schanden geborenen zu bezeichnen' (p. 217); and he adds: 'Daher erklärt es sich von selbst, dass erst so spät, vielleicht erst nach dem Tode der Maria, in der Gemeinde sich die Kunde von den wunderbaren Umständen der Geburt Jesu verbreitet.'

It cannot be said that Beyschlag's remarks in his recent *Leben Jesu* (i. 163 ff.) with regard to the Incarnation are very satisfactory. He argues that such passages as Rom. i. 3 distinctly imply the birth of Jesus from a human father (pp. 166, 170), and that the lineage of Joseph and not of Mary is referred to David. But there is good reason to suppose that both Joseph and the Virgin Mother were of the house and lineage of David (see Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 211; Pressensé, *Jésus-Christ*, p. 272; Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, i. 149; Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 20, E. T.), and it is quite arbitrary to affirm that such expressions as those contained in Acts ii. 30 or Rom. i. 3 exclude the Virgin birth, or that the latter fact was unknown to St. Peter and St. Paul. Moreover, it will be noticed that Beyschlag himself strongly refuses to believe (p. 167) that the story of the Incarnation can possibly be derived from any heathen source, even if that source was alleged to be the birth of a Plato from Apollo, and he therefore seeks for the origin of the story on Jewish-Christian grounds. He takes such expres-

sions as those which we find in Gal. iv. 29, Rom. ix. 8, 'He that was born after the Spirit,' ὁ μετὰ πνεῦμα γεννηθείς. From such expressions he maintains that it was but a small step to assume the generation without a human father of Him who, more than Isaac, was 'the child of the promise,' and that this step would be accelerated by such a passage as Isaiah vii. 14. But the Hebrew rendering of this last verse could not help Beyschlag much, and the Septuagint rendering of it is quite insufficient to explain the rise of the belief in the Incarnation on *Jewish-Christian* grounds (Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 219, 220), since, as Weiss points out with great force, there is one circumstance which can always be adduced against any attempt to derive the idea from Jewish-Christian views, viz. the fact that opposition to it was specially presented in such circles, in the subsequent rejection by the Ebionites of the supernatural conception of Jesus; moreover, it makes too great a demand upon our credulity to ask us to believe that this one prophecy, to which St. Luke never refers, combined with such expressions as those contained in Gal. iv. 29, Rom. ix. 8, could possibly have given rise to the circumstantial narratives of St. Matthew and St. Luke, to a story of such exquisite beauty—a beauty which has appealed to human hearts for eighteen centuries—as that of the third Evangelist (see Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 31). Beyschlag devotes a long note to the refutation of the defence put forward by Weiss on behalf of these Gospel narratives of the Incarnation, but it cannot be said that it meets the argument upon which Weiss insists as to the impossibility of explaining the rise of these stories on Jewish-Christian grounds, and Beyschlag has himself declared against their origin in heathen sources. On p. 170 he remarks that he had formerly defended the narratives, the historical character of which he now rejects, and he takes refuge in the belief that these narratives are, after all, but the outer clothing, the symbolical form, of what is a great and essential truth, viz. the fact that Christ was in very truth the Divine Child, the Founder of a new humanity, of whose personality the Holy Spirit must be indeed the generating principle, and the holy root from which that divine life unfolded itself: in support of all this he quotes Paul's description of Christ as the spiritual and heavenly man, but there is no ground for asserting that such expressions militate against St. Paul's knowledge of the Incarnation, and it may more justly be argued that Paul's conception of Christ as the sinless Head of humanity demands a recognition of a supernatural birth (see above pp. 250–252). One may be pardoned for thinking that Beyschlag might have done well to consider a little more fully the remark of Haupt's which he quotes with approval (p. 164): 'As to the fashion in which it pleased God to call into existence the miraculous Person of Jesus there is no definite statement of belief. Whether for this purpose He availed Himself of the Virgin birth, or of an absolute new creation, or of what other means, the Christian consciousness cannot of itself decide.' For a recent criticism of Beyschlag, see Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 109 ff.

CHAPTER V

OUR LORD'S LIFE AND TEACHING

WE have next to consider what testimony may be derived from the Pauline Epistles as to the mode of life which Jesus lived.[1] In using the expression 'mode of life' it is of course to be remembered that we have no right to expect in the Epistles such details as we find in the Gospels.[2] But there are undoubtedly statements which agree perfectly both with the facts and with the spirit of the Gospel narratives. Take, *e.g.*, such a passage as 2 Cor. viii. 9: 'For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor.' Here no doubt it may be said that the mind of the Apostle is dwelling upon the 'richness' of Christ in the glory which He had with the Father before the world was, the glory which He laid aside, when He took upon Him our nature in great humility. But the word which the Apostle uses is a remarkable one, which elsewhere carries with it the idea of temporal poverty, one might almost say of beggary.[3] So, too, in the passage Phil. ii. 5–8, which is so

[1] 'One phrase which dropped out of the [Nicene] Creed in its passage through the Council must have had a touching sound as it was repeated amongst the hills and valleys of the Holy Land, "Who for our salvation was incarnate, and *lived amongst men*." Eusebius declares that such words formed a part of the Creed of the Church of Palestine—what he had himself been taught in his own native city of Cæsarea in the plains of Sharon.'—Stanley's *Eastern Church*, p. 135, 2nd edit.

See also Maclear's *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 27, on the force of this phrase, καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώποις πολιτευσάμενον.

[2] Thenius argues that the scantiness of the details is easily accounted for by the aim of the Epistles, but that such references as we find are all the more weighty inasmuch as the writers of the Epistles did not start to write a life of Jesus (*Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, pp. 77, 78).

[3] Thus, Dean Plumptre, while he holds that the chief thought expressed is the renunciation by our Lord of His divine riches in the Incarnation, thinks that

often compared with that in 2 Corinthians, it may no doubt be maintained that when the Apostle speaks of Christ as 'emptying Himself,' and taking upon Him 'the form of a servant' the words refer, as in 2 Cor. viii. 9, to His pre-existent glory, and His assumption of the nature of man. But just as in the earlier passage the context shows that 'poverty' in its natural sense was also in the Apostle's mind, so here the extreme lowliness of life which marked our Lord's earthly career emphasises the Apostle's exhortation, and he again draws from it a most practical lesson as to the bearing of men towards their fellows.[1]

But without pressing this argument from the context, may we not fairly say that such passages enable us to realise, quite apart from the Gospels, that our Lord did not make the impression of being a ruler of this world, or a man of wealth, but that He lived in the form of a servant, and in outward poverty, to which His inward lordship and His divine riches formed a startling contrast (2 Cor. 8, 9; Phil. 2; Matt. 8, 20)?[2] Certainly it is quite arbitrary on Pfleiderer's part to maintain that Paul never refers to the earthly example of Jesus, even when there was the most direct and urgent occasion for him to do so, and to quote in support of this assertion the two passages

we can scarcely doubt that the words refer also to the outward aspect of our Lord's life. He chose the lot of the poor, almost of the beggar (the Greek word πτωχός is so translated, and rightly, in Luke xvi. 20–22), and as regards the outward mendicant aspect of our Lord's life, and that of His disciples, he refers to Matt. x. 10, Luke viii. 1–3, John xii. 6 (*Commentary on the N. T.* [Ellicott], ii. 391).

[1] Stanley's *Corinthians*, Essay referred to in chap. ii.

[2] 'Namentlich macht er nicht den Eindruck eines weltlichen Herren oder Reichen, sondern lebte in Knechtgestalt (Phil. ii.) und in äusserer Armuth, gegen welche freilich seine innerliche Herrlichkeit (1 Cor. ii. 8) und sein göttlichen Reichthum einen wunderbaren Gegensatz bildete (2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii., Matt. viii. 20).' Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 24. Comp. also Sabatier, *ubi supra*, 63; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. i. p. 39; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 65; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, Bd. iii. p. 69, where he refers, not 2 Cor. viii. 9, but Phil. ii. 4–8, to the life of poverty lived by Jesus ('das arme Leben Jesu'). Schenkel refers the 'poverty' to the Cross and to Christ's voluntary and lowly suffering (*Das Christusbild*, p. 249).

Baur (*Paulus*, ii. 267) and De Wette (*Exeget. Handbuch*, 3. Aufl. 369) both explain 2 Cor. viii. 9, of the historical life of Jesus, and His life of human poverty, but in doing this they both deny that the passage implies His pre-existence.

2 Cor. viii. 9, Phil. ii. 5, 6, in which he asserts that the Apostle does not allude to the extremely relevant instances of humility and willing self-sacrifice afforded by the earthly life of Jesus, but to the Incarnation, and therefore to considerations taken, not from history, but from dogmatic speculation.[1] But we are surely at liberty to accept the dogmatic bearing of these passages without rejecting the plain natural sense of such words as πτωχός and δοῦλος.[2]

Outwardly, indeed, there was nothing to distinguish Jesus from other men. He was a Jew (Rom. ix. 5), of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3), of the Jewish people and the Jews' religion, and in this relation obedient to the conditions of their law (Gal. iv. 4); He is represented as living amidst purely human surroundings, a brother amongst brethren, one of whom is mentioned by name (Gal. i. 19). And these allusions, like many others, are so purely incidental that they imply at least some previous knowledge on the part of the Christian community which the Apostle is addressing: on any other supposition they present a series of inexplicable puzzles.[3]

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 52. Pfleiderer bases his whole argument upon the very doubtful interpretation of 2 Cor. v. 16.

[2] Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 65.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 19, 23. 'Paulus muss also Jesum in dieser rein menschlichen Umgebung seinen Gemeinden vorgeführt haben; denn alle diese Erwähnungen kommen nur gelegentlich vor und setzen voraus, dass den Lesern dieses Alles schon wohl bekannt sey. *Und doch bei all dem hat er ihn als den Herrn in jenem hohen Sinne festgehalten und seinen Hörern geschildert!*' (p. 19). Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 55; and also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* pp. 289, 291; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, pp. 68, 69; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 18; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 55.

Comp. too, Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 62: 'Paul ne raconte pas plus les évènements de la vie de Jésus qu'il ne cite ses discours; mais il les suppose connus de ses lecteurs. A des gens qui n'auraient point entendu les principaux récits évangéliques, ses épîtres offriraient, à chaque ligne, d'indéchiffrables énigmes. Je n'en veux d'autre preuve que la manière dont l'apôtre des gentils parle des Douze, des frères de Jésus et de ses rapports avec eux.'

So, too, Huraut, in speaking of Paul's incidental reference to the brothers of the Lord, adds: 'Mais comment Saint Paul est-il venu à parler d'eux dans ses Eglises, sinon en racontant l'histoire du Sauveur, et le représentant au milieu de ses disciples et de ses frères?' (*ubi supra*, p. 16).

On these incidental notices of Paul and their relation to the narratives of the Gospels, Paret's words are of interest: 'Bis auf die Stammbäume Jesu hinaus—wenigstens was deren allgemeine Tendenz anlangt—erhält somit die synoptische

Moreover, this human life of poverty is described by St. Paul as a life of meekness and gentleness, as a life of service and self-denial. The whole tenor and spirit of His earthly life was that of unswerving obedience towards God, even unto death (Phil. ii. 8), and of self-forgetful, lowly, self-sacrificing love towards man—the exact opposite of the spirit of pride and self-pleasing (Rom. xv. 3; Phil. ii. 4).[1] It would certainly seem that when the Apostle beseeches his converts 'by the meekness and gentleness of Christ' (2 Cor. x. 1), he is recalling 'definite traits of a living human person, exemplified to the full in the life of Him to whom he ascribes them'; and we pass at once from such words to our Lord's own declaration concerning Himself: 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am *meek* and lowly of heart' (Matt. xi. 29).[2]

Historically this life of service was limited to Israel, and the Apostle speaks of Christ as 'a minister of the circumcision' (Rom. xv. 8);[3] but it must not be overlooked that in the Gospels no less than in the Epistles both Gentiles and Jews are alike regarded as receptive of salvation (Matt. xxviii. 19; Luke xxiv. 47; Col. i. 23; Gal. ii. 7–9; Rom. xi. 13; Ephes. iii. 1), and that Jesus Himself not only recognises this, but also announces the future participation of the Gentiles as a great fact (Matt. viii. 10; see also John x. 16).[4] St. Paul,

Geschichte Jesu durch Paulus ihre mittelbare oder unmittelbare Bestätigung, und muss als ein integrirender Theil seiner evangelischen Verkündigung gedacht werden' (*ubi supra*, p. 19 and note). On the force of Paul's testimony to the Davidic descent of Jesus, Rom. i. 3, see Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 438.

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 24; H. Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 445.

[2] See also Plumptre's *Commentary on 2 Corinthians* (Cassell), *in loco*, p. 397. St. Matthew uses the adjective πρᾷος, and St. Paul the noun πρᾳότης. Comp. to the same effect Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. p. 69; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 55. Weiss, in *Bibl. Theol.* 4th edit., sees in 2 Cor. x. 1, a general reference to the character of Jesus, but in the 5th edit. he refers the passage more specifically to Christ's self-surrender to death (p. 290). Comp. Schenkel, *Das Christusbild*, p. 249.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 24; Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 63; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 55; Keim, *ubi supra*, i. 39; and Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, pp. 14 and 18.

[4] Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 12, 5. Aufl.

too, often recurs to the love of Jesus, not as if it were a mere idea, but as something which, in Paret's words, had once been put to the proof, and still actually existed (2 Cor. v. 14; Gal. ii. 20), a characteristic of Jesus based upon the facts of history. In Paret's view, such a picture of Love as the Apostle draws in 1 Cor. xiii. may well have been inspired by the fact that the Apostle could fix his gaze upon Jesus as the historical pattern of all true thoughts and deeds of love, and even such an expression as *ἐν σπλάγχνοις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (Phil. i. 8) may have been used by him, not merely as marking in general terms the conception of Christian love, but also as carrying with it a certain reminiscence of the character of Jesus (cf. the frequent use of the verb *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι of Jesus Himself*, in the Gospels: Matt. ix. 36, xiv. 14, xx. 34; Mark i. 41, viii. 2; Luke vii. 13).[1]

No doubt it may be urged that when St. Paul writes, 'As the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ' (2 Cor. i. 6), or when he bids us strive to please our neighbours for their good unto edification, on the ground that 'even Christ pleased not himself' (Rom. xv. 3), he is only thinking of our Lord's exceptional sufferings and self-denial in His Cross and Passion. We may well believe that such a thought would never be long absent from the mind of one who could speak of himself as 'crucified with Christ,' but it is plain that the sufferings which so abundantly fell to the Apostle's own share were welcomed by him as holy and dear, because (as Paret expresses it) he regarded them as a continuation, a repetition, a copy of the sufferings of Jesus, and the more his own life was a life of suffering the more closely was the copy conformed to the original, the more powerful was the seal which he received of fellowship with his Lord (*συμμορφιζόμενος*, *κοινωνία*, Phil. iii. 10).[2] Nor is this to be dismissed as a mere Pauline conception; for, just as the

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 24, 25; similarly, Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 13.

Comp. also for similar references Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 69; Fr. Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, p. 63, 1887. Comp. also H. Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 198; Row's *Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 262, 4th edit.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 26.

Apostle speaks of a dying of Jesus which he always bore about in his own body (2 Cor. iv. 10), just as he tells the Corinthians that he dies daily (1 Cor. xv. 31), so had Jesus Himself described the sufferings which His followers would incur as His 'cup' (Matt. xx. 23).[1]

It is again in close harmony with Epistles and Gospels alike, that we find the Apostle entreating his Thessalonian converts to be 'imitators' of himself and of the Lord (1 Thess. i. 6), not only in their participation in the same sufferings, but also in their joy in the reception of them: 'and ye became imitators of us and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction with joy of the Holy Ghost.'[2] Nor is it easy to understand how St. Paul could thus exhort his converts to this practical *Imitatio Christi*, to be conformed to the image and pattern of Christ, unless he had before his eyes some historical facts upon which that example was based. So also, as we are well reminded, that description of the Christian life which has always been so pleasing to rationalism, and which it regards as the only correct one, viz. that which makes it a fulfilment of the divine commands, and an imitation of the pattern of virtue set by Jesus, is by no means wanting in St. Paul, although there are other aspects of his teaching which present to us something more than the categorical imperative and the example of the Saviour. For him, also, Christianity is 'a keeping of the commandments of God' (1 Cor. vii. 19), and it is his chief aim to make his own life, whether active or passive, a worthy image of the life of Jesus.[3] It is only because he himself thus strives to attain to the pattern of Christ, and to reproduce His life under the conditions peculiar to his own, that he can exhort the Corinthians to be 'imitators' of him, as he also

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 26.

[2] Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 15. Comp. Col. i. 24; 2 Cor. i. 5; 1 Thess. i. 6; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 181. Weiss, in *B. T.* 5. Aufl. p. 290, note, seems to confine these and similar texts too exclusively to the sufferings of Christ in His death. Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 63, refers also to 2 Thess. iii. 5, where the words *τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ* Χριστοῦ seem evidently to mean 'the patience of Christ,' *i.e.* 'the patience which Christ showed,' as in R. V.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 26.

is of Christ (1 Cor. xi. 1). It is exactly the self-forgetting, sacrificing love which subordinates all outward considerations to its own peculiar law—a love learned from Christ—which it behoves these Corinthians to learn from him (1 Cor. x. 33). So, too, the expression 'to walk worthily of the Lord' (Col. i. 10) may be fairly held to contain a reference to the historical life of Jesus in accordance with which Christians ought to walk as their rule and guide (cf. also iii. 12); and with these passages we may compare such expressions as those used in Phil. i. 20, iii. 10, and the close parallel exhortations in 1 Thess. iv. 1, 2.[1]

But the life of Jesus was not merely an ideal of moral excellence, it was the life of One of whom it could be said that He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without *sin*.[2] It is not unreasonable to ask, how Paul could speak as he does in Rom. viii. 1–3, and feel himself freed from the dominion of sin (of which every Jew in presence of a holy God

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, and Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 58.

It is to be noted that the word used by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. 1, and also in 1 Thess. i. 6, is μιμητής, an 'imitator'; the A. V. 'follower' does not at all indicate what is meant. The R. V. renders the word in these passages, 'imitators'; cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 16, Vulg. *imitatores*.

With the remarks in the text we may compare Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 63: 'Ce n'est donc pas un Christ absolument idéal et subjectif qui vit dans la conscience nouvelle de l'apôtre. Ce Christ intérieur reste bien en même temps un type extérieur, que Paul contemple dans son souvenir, qu'il apprend chaque jour à mieux connaître et à mieux imiter. On sait que l'imitation du Christ en effet est un des principes essentiels de la morale paulinienne; ce principe ne suppose-t-il pas de toute nécessité, un modèle extérieur, historique, que tous les croyants ont devant les yeux (1 Cor. xi. 1; Phil. ii. 5)? Jésus est donc tout ensemble et le principe immanent de la sanctification en l'homme, et l'idéal de la sainteté réalisé devant ses yeux.'

So, too, Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 14: 'Ce qui prouve encore que saint Paul a connu le Christ historique, c'est la manière dont il envisage la vie Chrétienne; Col. i. 10; Phil. iii. 10. . . . Ce n'est que parce qu'il est lui-meme imitateur de Christ, qu'il recommande aux Corinthiens de devenir ses imitateurs (1 Cor. xi. 1).'

[2] It seems fanciful and unnecessary to suppose with Sabatier (*ubi supra*, p. 236) that the words in Phil. ii. 6, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, may perhaps contain a reference to Matt. iv. 3. Ewald (*Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 300) is of opinion that 2 Cor. xi. 15 may also refer to the narrative of the Temptation in Matt. iv., but such a reference, even if it could be maintained, is hardly necessary to explain the Apostle's thought (see Meyer, *Corintherbriefe, in loco*).

was so deeply conscious), and, pointing to Jesus, exhort to a spiritual walk, if Christ had not been triumphant against the power of the senses.[1]

But, without pressing such considerations, we cannot separate Paul's testimony to the moral spirit which characterised the whole life of Jesus from the exceptionally weighty statement in 2 Cor. v. 21 : 'Who knew no sin.' It is difficult to believe that the Apostle could have demanded from his hearers that they should credit such a statement upon the strength of a mere word ; he must have enabled them, we may reasonably suppose, to give an independent approval to it by adducing the testimony of facts.[2] Nor must it be forgotten that no conception could be more strange to the Jewish consciousness of the Apostle than that of perfect sinlessness realised in any human being.[3] Yet it is evident, says Paret, that St. Paul based the universal importance and the redemptive power of the death upon the cross, not upon the mere fact that the Jew named Jesus had risen from the dead, but upon the fact that He who had thus died was One of whom it could be said that He *knew no sin* : that is to say, the significance of the death of Jesus depended not only upon what followed it, but upon what preceded it, upon that which Jesus, so to speak, brought with Him in His dying—viz. His sinlessness.[4]

[1] Thenius, *ubi supra*, pp. 62, 63.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 25 ; Thenius, *ubi supra*, pp. 52, 63 ; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 14. 'Tout ce qui précède suppose une instruction préalable ; car saint Paul s'exprime comme si personne ne pouvait lui contester ce qu'il dit. Il a dû aussi donner des faits à l'appui de la vérité qu'il se borne à poser, 2 Cor. v. 21. Pour croire à la sainteté parfaite de Jésus, ne fallait-il pas connaître sa vie ?' Ullmann, *Die Sündlosigkeit Jesu*, pp. 42–44, 79–98, 7. Aufl. 1863 ; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, p. 67 ; Roos, *ubi supra*, p. 65.

Weiss (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 290), however, thinks that Paul would scarcely have felt it needful to give historical proof of the sinlessness of Jesus, since it was self-understood in the case of the exalted Messiah, who by His death had redeemed the world ; at the same time he points out that it formed a part of the original Apostolic preaching.

[3] Ullmann, *ibid.* pp. 79, 85. See Matheson, 'Historical Christ of St. Paul,' in *Expositor*, ii. (2nd series), esp. pp. 143–146. 'Sinlessness, to St. Paul and to any Jew, would be a greater miracle than walking on the sea' (p. 143).

[4] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 11. Comp. also Schmid, *ubi supra*, pp. 500, 501, who points out that whilst the δικαίωμα (Rom. v. 18) may be specially referred to

Certainly, elaborate attempts have been made—as, *e.g.*, by Keim—to show that even cultured Paganism can compare with Judaism in humble consciousness of sin. But one of the authorities to whom Keim refers, and whose name stands high in the list of German Apologists, C. Ullmann, draws the clearest line of demarcation in this particular between the Gentile and the Jew.[1]

Nor can it be said that the parallel which has often been drawn between the sinlessness of Christ and the virtue of Socrates is anything to the point. For, in the first place, not only do the highest expressions used of Socrates by his disciples fall far short of the absolute sinlessness attributed to our Lord by St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John,[2] but, in our Lord's case, we have to consider not only the testimony of His followers, but also *the testimony of Himself*.[3] Thus it is to be noted that in

the one action of Christ's death, it is so mentioned as to show that this deed of obedience is considered by Paul as only the culminating point of a whole life lived in complete unbroken obedience towards God (cf. Phil. ii. 8). The idea of sinlessness, in Schmid's view, is also involved in that of a sacrificial offering, which must be faultless, and also in the consideration of Christ as the founder of a new life, free from death; for as death came by sin, so this life must come by its contrary; and the fact that sinlessness is so necessarily united with Paul's idea of Christ explains the reason why there are so few passages in which the Apostle expressly sets it forth.

[1] Comp. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. pp. 639 ff. with Ullmann, *ubi supra*, pp. 88–96.

Ullmann's remarks may well be compared with those of Dr. Matheson, as to the difficulty of accounting for the idea of attributing perfect sinlessness to any human being under the influence either of the polytheistic religions of paganism, or of the monotheistic creed of Israel.

[2] Keim, *ubi supra*, p. 641, admits that the most valuable testimony of all to the sinlessness of Jesus is the testimony of his companions, the Apostles, and refers, in this connection, to the following passages: 2 Cor. v. 21; Rom. i. 4, v. 18, viii. 3; 1 Peter ii. 22; Heb. iv. 15, vii. 26, and many others. So, too, Paret, Weiss, and Thenius, who adds 1 John iii. 5.

Keim (p. 650) goes so far as to say that in the case of Jesus those who wish to retain the word 'sinlessness'—originated by dogmatic reasons—for history may do so.

Comp. also Schenkel, *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, pp. 246, 247, who understands the expression 'who knew no sin' subjectively, not objectively, and is constrained to explain τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν by 'der wissentlich keine Sünde gethan' (2 Cor. v. 21).

[3] Ullmann points out that the only case in heathendom with which we should most probably conceive the idea of moral faultlessness to be associated, that of Socrates, falls far short of the sinlessness of Jesus as it is presented to us in the

his examination of the whole question Hase ('Leben Jesu,' pp. 61, 62), whilst he maintains that what is said by the Apostles does not much exceed the testimony of a Xenophon to his teacher, evidently feels it far more difficult to account for the self-consciousness of Jesus and His testimony of Himself.

Indeed, Hase places a weapon in the hand of the Apologist by reminding us that the appeal of Jesus (John viii. 46) comes to us through the medium of the same writer who of all others has declared the refusal to acknowledge sin to be an act of self-deception.[1] Yet Jesus, adds Hase, never places Himself with respect to God in the relation of a sinner with the exception of the prayer in Matt. vi. 12, which is not of necessity to be regarded as His own individual expression.[2] But there are other elements in the case of which Hase does not take sufficient account. It has been well pointed out that not only do the Apostles, with one accord, ascribe to Jesus a perfect freedom from sin, but that this teaching cannot be placed on the same level with that of a Xenophon to a Socrates, since in every New Testament writer it is combined with a consciousness of the universal sinfulness of human nature and its consequent need of redemption. But the more this is realised, the more difficult does it become

Gospels. The only passage which could be brought forward to support the assertion that his revering disciples regarded him as absolutely free from moral failings, and in all respects perfect, is Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, lib. i. c. i. sect. 11. But here the immediately preceding context, and the whole tenor of the defence, proves that it is more legality—and especially the legality of the public dealings and discourses of Socrates—than morality in its higher signification, which is here intended. And even if the words are to be understood as applied to morality in its widest sense, the main point, adds Ullmann, is wanting, viz. *the testimony of Socrates himself.*

After referring to the great saying of the Redeemer in John viii. 46, which he discusses at length, he insists that another important distinction between the philosopher and the Saviour lies in the very fact that whilst the demon of Socrates chiefly *warned* him against things which he was *not* to do, Christ *positively* acted in all things from a pure consciousness of God within, from that Divine Spirit by which He was impelled (*ubi supra*, pp. 90 and note, 91 and note).

[1] *Leben Jesu*, p. 62. So, too, Ullmann, *ubi supra*, p. 67.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 62; Keim, *ubi supra*, p. 642. See the remarkable passage in Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 338-341.

to explain the Apostle's words in any but their strictest sense.

Nor can it be maintained that this picture of our Lord's sinlessness is derived from the fourth Gospel only, and that it is consequently destitute of weight. The testimony to that sinless life is by no means dependent upon one memorable appeal recorded by St. John: it is in entire harmony with the picture drawn in the earlier Gospels: and St. Paul's words (2 Cor. v. 21) furnish us with a corroborative proof of the marvellous impression which the 'moral character' of Jesus must have made on those most closely associated with Him, as is admitted even in quarters where we might least expect it.[1]

But whilst the Epistles thus reveal to us a gracious and a spotless character, and whilst in them no less than in the Gospels it is the love of Christ which constrains man to leave all and follow Him, these same Epistles ascribe to Jesus not only a divine character, but also a divine power. It is no doubt true that we find in the Epistles of the New Testament no direct reference to any specific miracle wrought by Jesus during His earthly life, but even a witness so unprejudiced as Karl Hase admits that a miraculous agency of Jesus—*i.e.* a power of healing, which far outstripped the knowledge and power of His contemporaries—is authentically disclosed to us by its continuance in the Apostolic Church (1 Cor. xii. 10, 28), and in itself is so little doubtful that without it a middle term is wanting for the comprehension of the life of Jesus.[2] But just as the words *κυριακὸν*

[1] Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 15, and see above, chap. ii. p. 54.

[2] Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 93.

See also Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 81–83, 5. Aufl.; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 66; Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* pp. 137 ff.; and comp. the forcible remarks of Beyschlag and Wittichen (see above, chap. ii. pp. 58 and 97).

Upon the absence in the Pauline Epistles of references to any specific miracle of Jesus, Row's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 305 ff., may be consulted, and Westcott's *Study of the Gospels*, p. 183, note 1: 'It is remarkable that there is (as far as I know) no direct allusion to the miracles of our Lord in the Epistles; but it is possible (Stanley, *l. c.*) that the word δαιμόνια in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21, which occurs elsewhere in St. Paul only in 1 Tim. iv. 1, may be chosen with a distinct reference to the antagonism so often brought out in the Lord's life in His *casting out* devils. It is a similar fact, that in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers there are (I

δεῖπνον (the Lord's Supper) form a technical expression, and carry with them a whole history, which must remain obscure unless such terms can be historically explained, so, too, is this equally the case, as Paret reminds us, with many other expressions in the Pauline Epistles: *e.g.*, the words εὐαγγέλιον, ἐκκλησία, ἀδελφοὶ, διαθήκη, ἀπόστολος. To take the last word only, Paret draws attention to the fact that this word, with the exception of 2 Cor. viii. 23, Phil. ii. 25, is always used by Paul in its historical meaning, as a technical term, and that it must accordingly be explained, as we actually find to be the case in the Pauline Gospel of St. Luke (vi. 13). When we consider the immense importance which Paul attached to the fact that he was himself 'a called Apostle' (κλητὸς Ἀπόστολος), it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that the choice and calling of the Apostles by Jesus would have found a place in his Gospel.[1]

But Paul further presupposes that, in accordance with his conception of an Apostle, a special power of working miracles must have been bestowed upon him (σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, 2 Cor. xii. 12).[2] This points back, as Paret further reminds us, to an act on the part of Jesus, such as is signified in Matt. x. 1, Mark iii. 14, vi. 7, Luke ix. 1, and he who bestowed this power could not be considered as

believe) no specific allusions to the miracles of the Apostles. The omission in both cases arises from the nature of the writings.' With these remarks of Dr. Westcott upon the word δαιμόνια it is interesting to compare those of Beyschlag in Meyer's *Commentar*, 'Der Brief des Jacobus,' p. 130, 5. Aufl. 1888, where, in his discussion of chap. ii. verse 19, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσι καὶ φρίσσουσι, he is inclined to see a reference to the Synoptical narratives of those possessed with demons. H. Ewald positively affirms such a reference in the words (*Das Sendschreiben an die Hebräer und Jakobos Rundschreiben, in loco*, p. 200): 'unverkennbar ist es auch hier die Erinnerung an die evangelische Geschichte welche durch die Worte lebhaft genug hindurchklingt, Mark. v. 8–14.'

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 17; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 39, and references; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 69.

[2] Paret, *ibid.*; comp. Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 18, 3. Aufl.: 'Der Ausdruck σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου lässt diese Wunderthaten als Kennzeichen eines richtigen Apostels, als Legitimation eines solchen erkennen, indem der bestimmte Artikel den Begriff "Apostel" betont.' On this force of the article in the expression σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου see also Fisher's *Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 150.

destitute of it himself: he could not give more than he possessed, nor possess less than he gave.[1] But Paul directly affirms that these miraculous powers were derived from Christ (Rom. xv. 17–19), and in his conception there are these two essentials of Apostleship: (1) that the Apostle had been called and sent by the Lord Himself; (2) that he had been furnished by Him with extraordinary miraculous powers.[2]

Moreover, Paul must have been acquainted with the fact that these Apostles were originally twelve in number, and the term 'the twelve' would seem to have been so frequently employed that it was retained even when, regarded as a mere number, its use was incorrect (1 Cor. xi. 5):[3] and in this connection it may be observed that the position occupied by two of the Apostles to whom Paul refers by name (Gal. ii. 9)—Peter and John—is singularly in accordance with the prominence assigned to them in the Gospel narratives.[4]

No doubt it is still open to the author of 'Supernatural Religion' to take up such a position as the following: 'The

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 17, 18: 'Und der Solches verlieh kann doch nicht selbst ohne diese Macht gedacht werden. Er konnte nicht mehr geben, als er hatte, nicht weniger haben als er gab.' To the same effect Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 15: 'Si les apôtres devaient justifier leur vocation en exerçant la puissance miraculeuse qu'ils avaient reçue de Jésus, Jésus à son tour n'a-t-il pas dû justifier la sienne, en déployant devant eux la puissance souveraine qu'il tenait du Père? Jésus a donc fait les miracles, et ces miracles Paul a dû les connaitre, car il a dû les raconter pour justifier aux yeux des Juifs et les païens la haute idée qu'il se faisait de Jesus-Christ.'

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 17, note. In Rom. xv. 17–19, the Apostle speaks of those things which Christ wrought through him, by word and deed, in the power of signs and wonders; and this attestation gains in importance if we bear in mind that this Epistle to the Romans was written from Corinth, containing the salutations of several Corinthians—*i.e.* it was written from the very Church to which a few months previously Paul had made the appeal to miracles just quoted as wrought by him in the presence of its members. See Birks, *Horæ Apostolicæ*, pp. 362, 363.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 18; Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 63; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 66; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 243, and esp. Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 69.

[4] 'N'a-t-il pas dû, par conséquent, s'informer des raisons qui leur avaient donné cette position supérieure au sein du collège apostolique? A-t-il pu ne pas savoir que saint Jean était le disciple bien-aimé du Sauveur, et que la promesse de fonder l'Eglise avait été faite à saint Pierre?' (Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 17). Comp. Matheson, 'Historical Christ of Saint Paul,' in *Expositor*, vol. ii. (2nd series) pp. 287–292.

remaining books of the New Testament Canon [those which follow the Gospels and the Acts] require no separate examination because, even if genuine, they contain no additional testimony to the reality of Divine Revelation beyond the implied belief in such doctrines as the Incarnation and Resurrection. It is unquestionable, we suppose, that in some form or other the Apostles believed in these miracles, and the assumption that they did so supersedes the necessity for examining the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles and Apocalypse. In like manner, the recognition as genuine of four Epistles of Paul, which contain his testimony to miracles, renders it superfluous to discuss the authenticity of the other letters attributed to him.'[1] But can a critic who thus excuses himself from any further examination of documents, many of which are increasingly felt to be the writings of the man whose name they bear, be thought to have attained to that absence of preconception which Strauss and his followers so dogmatically laid down as the first condition of impartial research? 'The most recent demand,' writes Hagenbach,[2] 'has been for an entire absence of preconception.' 'Taken absolutely,' he adds, with truth, 'such a demand is impossible of fulfilment, for even those who make the demand have their preconceptions—*e.g.* as to the possibility or otherwise of miracles.'

Now it is exactly this unscientific position of objecting to miracles *a priori* which Paret refuses to occupy, and, in his view, in this one verse, 2 Cor. xii. 12 (in which, as he points out, all the three words employed in the New Testament for miracles most remarkably stand together; comp. also Rom. xv. 18), the whole dogmatic criticism of the history of Jesus by Strauss is ruined.[3] To those who forget how entirely Strauss neglected even the four great Epistles of Paul as sources for the life of Jesus, Paret's judgment is not likely to

[1] *Essays*, p. 165, 1889.

[2] *Encyclopädie und Methodologie der theolog. Wissenschaften*, p. 213, 10. Aufl.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 18, note. 'An diesem einen Verse, 2 Cor. xii. 12 (vgl. Röm. xv. 18 f.), wo merkwürdigerweise die drei im Neuen Testament vorkommenden Bezeichnungen für Wunderthaten nebeneinander stehen, wird die ganze Strauss'sche dogmatische Kritik der Geschichte Jesu . . . zu schanden.'

seem of consequence, but, as if in anticipation of such objectors, he immediately adds that at least one cannot pass over this verse, 2 Cor. xii. 12, as easily as Baur ('Paulus,' ii. 334). In Baur's opinion, just as the threatened miraculous punishment in 1 Cor. v. 4 came to nothing, so, too, a like negative result followed in the other cases where the Apostles claimed miraculous powers. But, asks Paret, could the Apostle, in the face of eye-witnesses, refer to nothing but simple expressions of wish and will, when speaking as if he actually performed *σημεῖα, τέρατα, δυνάμεις*? or must the Apostles be supposed to have understood so little of nature, and of what was possible within the limits of experience, that 'specially remarkable results of their activity, effects of an active and working energy,' appeared to them as *σημεῖα κ.τ.λ.*, and were represented by them as if they were such? Why, then, were not these miracles, these signs, and wonders, and mighty works, related also of John the Baptist?[1] Yet if the public were so eager to attribute miraculous powers to any great personality, such an omission on their part is quite unaccountable; and if it is strange that the Jewish public did not attribute such powers to the Baptist, it is still more strange that the early Christian Church should have refrained from doing so,[2] especially if we endorse the recent statement of Renan, that John the Baptist was only a reflection of the prophet Elijah.[3]

But if, as we have seen, St. Paul could refer to the miraculous power of Jesus as still at work (Rom. xv. 17–19, comp. 1 Cor. xiii. 28, 29, Gal. iii. 5), we have in this circumstance a fair explanation of the fact that in the Apostolical letters no detailed account is given of particular miracles performed by the Lord during His earthly lifetime, and it must never be forgotten that that greatest of miracles, the resurrection of Jesus, is nowhere more emphatically or repeatedly attested

[1] Paret, *ibid.* Comp. also Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* p. 117, in his letter addressed to Strauss.

[2] Cf. Westcott on *Gospel of St. John*, x. 41. 'And many resorted unto Him, and said, John did no miracle.' The notice shows how little inclination there was to invest popular teachers with miraculous powers. The new Elijah might have seemed above all men likely to show signs; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 367; Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom* (new edit. 1886), pp. 190, 191.

[3] Renan, *History of Israel*, ii. 236, E. T.

than in these same Apostolical letters.[1] Of course it may be maintained that this same claim of the Apostles to miraculous powers stamps them *ipso facto* as ignorant enthusiasts and visionary dreamers. But in addition to the fact that a mere set of fanatics could never have produced such results as those which E. de Pressensé so strikingly termed the one indisputable miracle, the resurrection of a world, it has been truly said that it will never be possible for anyone to believe St. Paul to have been a mere fanatic, who duly considers his calmness, his wisdom his prudence, and, above all, his humility, a virtue which is not less inconsistent with fanaticism than with imposture.[2] Instead of arguing that Paul's claim to work miracles weakens the impression of his character, it would surely be equally reasonable to maintain that the elevation of his character ought to carry with it the acknowledgment of his claim. No one has remarked more forcibly than Weizsäcker upon the Apostle's intrepid calmness in moments of the greatest danger and excitement; while Keim has placed a weapon in the hands of Christian Apologists by supplying them with a fresh argument against opponents who insist upon the visionary character of the Apostle.[3]

There is a remarkable saying of the English Deist Collins

[1] See Schmid, *ubi supra*, pp. 81–83, 5. Aufl.

On the derivation of Paul's miraculous power from Christ, see Archdeacon Wilson's essay on Miracles in his *Essays and Addresses*, pp. 209–228, 1887; Row's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 305 ff.

[2] Cf. Lord Lyttelton's *Observations on the Conversion of St. Paul*, and the quotation from the same in Conybeare and Howson's *Saint Paul*, p. 81. So also C. Uhlhorn, *Moderne Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu*, p. 114, 4th ed., 1892, on the moral character of Paul as a corroboration of the truthfulness of his claim to work miracles.

[3] Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 462–464, in his discussion of the shipwreck in Acts xxvii., and Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 583, note, where he points out that notwithstanding Paul's belief in the words of Jesus which he had heard in ecstacies and visions (2 Cor. xii. 9), the Apostle never employs such words in his communications of Christian doctrine, although he might easily have done so, but simply the historically spoken words of Jesus (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15). Keim expresses surprise that Apologists have not made use of this observation, which shows us, he adds, that we must not carry too far the theory of Paul's visionary character. On the early Christian Church, and its power of critical discernment, see also Uhlhorn, *ubi supra*, p. 112; and see also above, p. 144, and the similar instance quoted by Weiss.

to the effect that if St. Paul had stated that he had worked miracles he would believe him, since the Apostle was 'too much of a gentleman to tell a lie.' Such a confession at least shows the impression made, even where we might little expect it, by the Apostle's urbanity and courtesy, which are nowhere more plainly revealed than in the same Epistle in which his claim to be an Apostle is so clearly stated to rest upon his miraculous powers (2 Cor. xii. 12).

But if we approach the matter from another point of view, it seems reasonable to suppose that while Paul may be called the Apostle of the spirit and not of the letter, yet his theology was a theology of facts: his Christian consciousness rests upon facts; to these facts his teaching points back, and out of these facts it has grown. It must never be forgotten that the Pauline Epistles and the other Epistles of the New Testament have at any rate this feature in common with the Acts and the Gospels, viz. that they represent Jesus as the Christ.[1] But this fact, which was the sum and substance of the Apostolic message, enables us to get behind, as it were, the letters of St. Paul, and to see how much they presuppose. Paul, for whom the historical Christ, or Jesus as the Christ, is all and everything, must often in his missionary journeys have travelled through districts where the name Jesus and the conception of the Christ were equally unknown: such words were perfectly unintelligible, and it was necessary to explain and unfold their meaning.[2] But

[1] Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 66; for references to other writers see below. See esp. *The Religion of the Christ*, pp. 24 ff. (Dr. Stanley Leathes' *Bampton Lectures*, 1874).

Comp. Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 11, 1890.

But no one has insisted upon this more strongly than Schwegler; cf. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, i. 91.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 9. The same line of argument is adopted by Sabatier, who, after remarking, with Paret, that modern criticism with all its subtleness sometimes ignores the most obvious facts, reminds us how it has forgotten that Paul was a missionary before he was a theologian, and that he preached the Gospel in places where men had never heard any mention of Jesus or Messiah. Must he not then, of necessity, have made known this subject—Jesus—and explained this attribute—Messiah? Must he not have given in the synagogues of Asia such an idea and such an impression of Jesus, His life, His miracles, His death, His resurrection, that receptive souls would naturally have been brought to say, 'This Jesus was the Christ'? How can we conceive apart from all this the

out of the great number of Jews who were called Jesus,[1] Paul pointed out prominently one Jew of this name, predicated of Him all the high attributes which are contained in the Pauline conception of the Christ, viz. that He was the Son of God, the Lord in the highest sense of that expression—which, so far from disclaiming it, actually included a claim to worship—the Redeemer and Judge of the world; the Lord of the living and the dead; the Second Man, who divided the whole history of mankind into two halves; the initiator and future perfecter of an entirely new epoch of the life of the human race; the head of humanity, just as Adam was its original first representative.[2]

But unless this affirmation that Jesus was the Christ was to become void of all reality; unless this faith was to degenerate into a brainless superstition, and its proclamation into nothing but a mere make-believe, then, as Paret forcibly argues, the Apostle was bound to show how he came to assign such lofty attributes to that particular Jew who bore the name of Jesus, to define the subject of his proposition more accurately, or, in other words, he was bound to endeavour to produce such an impression of the Person and the history of this Jesus as should influence thinking and receptive minds to identify him with the Christ, and to hold this opinion with as much firmness as Paul himself, who can exchange one name with the other, and use the title Christ as if it was a proper-name (*e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 3): the same man who, in his letters to the Corinthians, used his great dialectical skill to establish the proposition 'Paul is an Apostle,' and appealed for this purpose to his inner and out-

missionary preaching of the Apostle? (*L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 57). So, too, Huraut, in connection with a similar argument, points out the improbability that Paul who had as his companion a Saint Luke, could have ignored in his preaching all the details of the Gospel narrative: 'Lui, qui avait pour compagnon Saint Luc, dont l'Evangile est si riche de détails, comment aurait-il ignoré ces détails? Il y a plus, comment aurait-il pu évangéliser, s'il ne les eût point connus? Saint Paul, en effet, allait annoncer Jésus-Christ dans les contrées où ce nom n'avait point encore été prononcé. Or, ce Jésus qu'il proclamait comme le moyen seul de salut, comment aurait-il pu faire naître la foi en lui, s'il ne se fût appuyé sur les faits? Comment des païens se seraient-ils rendus au nouveau Dieu qu'on leur prêchait, si des faits incontestables à leurs yeux n'étaient venus forcer leur assentiment, et désarmer leur résistance?' *Paul a-t-il connu le Christ historique?* (p. 10). Comp. also Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 22, 1891.

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 9, 10, note. [2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 10.

ward experiences, to his deeds and sufferings, has surely taken not less but greater pains to establish the more weighty proposition, 'Jesus is the Christ,' the Son of God, 'the Lord' in that high sense of the word in which He was always so called by Paul.[1] Certainly we do not possess a fundamental analysis of these terms in the Pauline letters, nor, indeed, as Paret points out, could we expect to find them there, since in all of these letters the Apostle is writing to those who were already believers. The great mass of his historical information concerning Jesus belonged to the period when, in accordance with his own figurative expression, he had begotten a Church, cared for it as a foster-mother, and nourished it with milk (1 Cor. iv. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 2).[2]

But, according to the Gospels, Jesus not only proclaimed Himself to His disciples as the Christ, He proclaimed also the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of God. Even before His Sermon on the Mount He had repeated the Baptist's message, 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;' He had taught in the synagogues of Galilee, and preached the Gospel of the kingdom. Once, and once only, in the Gospels, did He speak of Himself as the founder of a Church, and even on that occasion the Church is clearly inseparable from the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xvi. 18, 19).[3] But if we turn to the Epistles, do they not evidently presuppose the kingdom of God as Christ proclaimed it, and the Church of God which

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 11. To the same effect Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 57.

[2] Huraut (p. 11), in company with Paret (p. 27), lays stress upon the peculiar composition of the Pauline Churches, and reminds us that the touching narratives of the Gospels would appeal with special force to the poor and unlearned, to pious and faithful women; this affectionate and historical element of the Apostle's gospel, which only comes into prominence from time to time, but which forms a peaceful hidden foundation, is easily overlooked whilst we conceive of Him as disputing with party emissaries, and opposing impure sectaries; but if at the outset the Apostle had employed such dialectical arguments as we find in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, the personal composition of his Churches must have been widely different from what was actually the case; cf. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, pp. 62, 67.

[3] Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, p. 221, and see also pp. 226, 227; and comp. Farrar, *Messages of the Books*, p. 31. What could be more unsatisfactory than the way in which Harnack relegates Matt. xvi. 18 and xviii. 17, to the second century, and supposes that the title ἐκκλησία may have been derived from Paul (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. 69)?

Christ had founded ?[1] It is to be noted, in the first place, that St. Paul refers three times to the Church of God—the Church, that is, which he had once persecuted ; and this repeated use of the term with reference to the period of his persecuting fury shows us that it was a term which he had found already in existence, and not one which he had himself set up for the Christian community (see Gal. i. 13 ; 1 Cor. xv. 9 ; Phil. iii. 6).

Weizsäcker, in a remarkable passage, draws special attention to this point,[2] and from the same passage it will be seen that, in his view, the idea of the kingdom of heaven precedes the figurative conception of the body of Christ and an all-embracing Church.

Certainly we find very clear indications that the laws of the kingdom, its characteristics, the methods of its working, are set forth by St. Paul in entire harmony with the teaching and conceptions of the Gospels.[3] It is when 'the time is fulfilled' (Mark i. 14, 15) that our Lord comes, preaching the Gospel of the kingdom, declaring the kingdom of God to be at hand ; it is 'when the fulness of the time was come' (Gal. iv. 4)[4] that the Advent of the Saviour redeemed those that were under the law, so that, led by the Spirit, they are no longer servants, but sons and heirs of the kingdom of God (Gal. iv. 6, and v. 18, 21). And as with our Lord, so also with St. Paul, it is the same word, 'the Gospel,' which strikes the keynote of his teaching (Mark i. 14, and Rom. i. 2)—a word which the Apostle had already found in the Christian

[1] Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, pp. 326–328, 1890 ; Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, zweite Abtheilung, pp. 358, 359, 1. Hälfte, 1887 ; see also Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 37 and 39.

[2] Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 620.

[3] Lipsius on Rom. xiv. 17, asserts that with Paul 'the kingdom of God' always refers to the future Messianic kingdom (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. [2nd half] p. 176), but Wendt and Gess, *ubi supra*, both point out that as in the discourses of Jesus Himself, so also in the Epistles of Paul 'the kingdom' is sometimes spoken of as future, sometimes as actually present. Comp. for the former Gal. v. 21 ; 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 50 ; 1 Thess. ii. 12 ; and for the latter conception Rom. xiv. 19 ; 1 Cor. iv. 20 ; Col. i. 13. See the significance of Paul's teaching with regard to the kingdom of God, and its connection with the discourses of Jesus, well drawn out by Fr. Roos, *ubi supra*, pp. 44, 45.

[4] Pfleiderer, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 171 ; Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 395 ; Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, p. 182.

Church, consecrated by the use of Christ Himself, the best description of that message of freedom and salvation which the Lord and His followers after Him were to proclaim (Rom. i. 2, 15, 16, x. 15; Gal. i. 6, ii. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17 and ix. 14; 2 Cor. ii. 12, iv. 3).[1]

If, advancing a step further, we do not find in the Pauline Epistles such frequent allusions to our Lord's Sermon on the Mount as we find, *e.g.*, in the Epistle of St. James, yet the Apostle repeatedly expresses himself, to Thessalonians, Romans, and Corinthians alike, in the spirit, if not in the letter, of Christ's teaching, and with a constant reference to the laws of His kingdom. Thus he can tell the Corinthians that in doing wrong and defrauding their brethren they were excluding themselves from the kingdom of God (1. Cor. vi. 7). 'Why do ye not,' he asks, 'rather take wrong, and be defrauded?' an appeal in which we trace a reminiscence of the words of Jesus Himself (Matt. v. 39, 40).[2] Again, later on in the same chapter, we see how the Apostle represents Christian freedom in a manner quite in harmony with our Lord's own decision as to things indifferent (comp. 1 Cor. vi. 12 with Matt. xvii. 26, 27). A similar spirit pervades the passage Rom. xiv. 13–15, whilst the intervening verse (Rom. xiv. 14), where the Apostle exclaims 'I know, and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself' vividly reminds us of Matt. xv. 11–20 (comp. also 1 Cor. x. 7 with Matt. xv. 11, and with what was probably our Lord's own custom: Matt. ix. 11, xi. 19. Comp. also 1 Cor. vi. 13 with Matt. xv. 17).[3]

[1] Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 60, 62, 63.

[2] Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 683; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 45. Comp. the Apostle's own practice, 1 Cor. iv. 12, and the teaching of Christ, Matt. v. 44; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70; Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 253, E. T. Matheson compares verses 2 and 3 of this same chapter with our Lord's own saying, Matt. xix. 28.

So, too, Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 154. But more probably Dan. vii. 22 was in the Apostle's mind, although the reference to Matt. might be included. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeit. J. C.* i. 255, compares 1 Cor. vi. 2, with *Wisdom* iii. 18.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 39, 40; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70. So, too, Huraut, *ubi supra*, pp. 31, 32.

Both Paret and Huraut attach importance to the Apostle's expression, Rom.

The standard of truthfulness which he recognises as binding upon the same Church of Corinth, and upon his own conduct, is that prescribed by Jesus (2 Cor. i. 17; Matt. v. 37),[1] and the practical advice which forms the concluding part of his Epistle to the Church at Rome often strikingly reminds us of the Sermon on the Mount.[2] Indeed, it is not too much to add that the Apostle's description of the kingdom of God (Rom. xiv. 17) reads like a brief summary of its description in the same Sermon on the Mount: the righteousness, peace, and joy, which form the contents of the kingdom in the Apostle's conception are found side by side in the Saviour's Beatitudes;[3] nor can we fail to notice how both St. Matthew and St. Luke contrast the anxious care for meat and drink with seeking in the first place for the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Nor must it be forgotten that Paul's fundamental idea of 'righteousness' may be said to be rooted in the teaching of Jesus, inasmuch as it is opposed to the prevailing idea of a merely external

xiv. 14, 'I am persuaded in the Lord Jesus' (πέπεισμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ), as also do those writers who cannot conclude with them that the expression involves a retrospective knowledge of the historical Christ, or a reference to some saying of the Saviour; yet when we compare the whole passage with Matt. xv. 11–20, we can at least agree with the above-mentioned in regarding this close comparison as a proof that the Apostle had apprehended the general spirit and mind of Christ.

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 40; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 31; Meyer's *Commentar* on the *Korintherbriefe*, *in loco*, and also on James v. 12, p. 226, 5. Aufl.; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 171; Roos, *ubi supra*, p. 64; cf. Plumptre, *in loco* (Ellicott's *Commentary*, ii. 366).

[2] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 62; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 45; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 31. Comp., *e.g.*, Rom. xii. 14, 17, 20, 1 Thess. v. 15, with Matt. v. 39, 44, and the whole section Rom. xiv. 16–21. Comp. also Rom. xiv. 4, and ii. 1, with the condemnation of uncharitable judgments in Matt. vii. 1, and Phil. iv. 6 with Matt. vi. 25, 34. See Kühl, in 5th edition of Meyer's *Commentar* on *I. Brief des Petrus*, p. 187.

Paret remarks that if we possessed a full collection of the sayings of Jesus on the one hand, and of all the Epistles of Paul on the other, we should probably find an extraordinary number of references in the latter to the former, but that, as it is, points of contact are not wanting, and he instances the close connection between the moral exhortations in the passages of the Epistle to the Romans just cited and the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount. Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 39.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 40, who parallels Rom. xiv. 17, 'Beschreibung des Reiches Gottes,' with Matt. v. 3 ff., 'Eingang der Bergpredigt.' Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70.

righteousness, to a self-righteousness such as that of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. vi. 33, v. 20, 6; Luke xvi. 15, xviii. 9, 14).[1]

As this kingdom is the kingdom of the *Father*—the Father whom Jesus came to reveal, speaking by the revelation of Fatherhood, not only to one chosen nation, but to the innermost life of each individual man[2]—so the word *Abba*, that word of the heart and mouth of Jesus (as Volkmar calls it), which carries with it the distinctive mark and token, the symbolism of His whole revelation, passes into the Christian Church; and not only in Rome and Galatia, but everywhere where men prayed without wrath and doubting, they do so in the spirit of sonship, in the spirit of a little child.[3]

Thus, whilst both in the Gospels and in the Epistles, the Ten Commandments remain the fundamental law of life and godliness, there is also in Gospels and Epistles alike

[1] Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 457; Beyschlag in Meyer's *Commentar*: 'Der Brief des Jacobus,' p. 38, 5. Aufl.; and Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, pp. 88, 89. Comp. also his remarks on the conception of the kingdom of God in 1 Cor. iv. 20, and Paul's strong reproof of the sins mentioned in ch. v. and vi. with Matt. v. 27 ff., 38 ff., and xii. 28, xviii. 15, p. 60.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 80.

[3] Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 59, 60. Comp. Gal. iv. 4–7; Rom. viii. 15–17; Mark x. 15–16, xiv. 36; and see Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 577, 602, who remarks that the word *Abba* in Gal. iv. 6, Rom. viii. 15, presupposes an existing formula of prayer, and probably refers to the Lord's Prayer. See Roos, *ubi supra*, p. 100, and comp. also Kühl's remark on 1 Pet. i. 17, καὶ εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε: 'vielleicht mit Recht meint Huther nach Weiss (p. 172), dass Petrus hier auf das Vaterunser anspielt' (Meyer's *Commentar, in loco*, 5. Aufl. p. 108). With the remarks of Weizsäcker we may compare those of Wendt (*Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 159): 'In dem Gebetsrufe, welchen Paulus als die Aeusserung des den Christen zu Theil gewordenen "Geistes der Kindschaft" hinstellt, "Abba, Vater!" (Gal. iv. 6; Röm. viii. 15), hören wir noch den lautlichen Nachhall der Anrede, mit welcher Jesus selbst sich in seinen Gebeten an Gott gewandt und welche er ebenso seine Jünger in ihren Gebeten zu gebrauchen gelehrt hatte.'

Comp further on the word *Abba* and its significance in Rom. and Gal. Plumptre in Ellicott's *Commentary*, i. 228; and Bishop of Derry's *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, pp. 20, 21.

Roos, *ubi supra*, p. 199, is inclined to find a further reference to the Lord's Prayer in 2 Tim. iv. 18, but see Prebendary Gibson's article on 'Sources of St. Paul's Teaching' (*Expositor*, vol. iv. 129, 130, 2nd series), where he refers this and the preceding verse to Psalm xxii. 21, 22, as their probable source.

something far higher than the negative duty of refraining from injury to our neighbour[1]—there is, in both alike, the fulfilling of the law of love, the bearing of one another's burdens, which is the law of Christ[2]—there is, in both alike, the recognition of the Saviour's Presence in the least of His brethren, against whom if any man sinned, he sinned against Christ.[3] Nothing in that kingdom of the Father was to be accomplished by external violence, but by rendering to all their dues, by perseverance, patience, endurance: faith in God, a faith rooted in His righteousness, would alone give the victory, a victory which every Christian must prepare to gain by suffering.[4,5]

[1] Volkmar, *ubi supra*, pp. 64, 65. Comp. 1 Cor. vi. 9, Rom. ii. 21, 22, xxii. 9, with Mark x. 19, vii. 21, 22 (and with Matt. xxii, 39, 40; Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 40; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 31): 'Die heiligen zehn Gebote Gottes bleiben das Grundgesetz für das Gottesvolk in Ewigkeit (Mc. x. 19, vii. 21, 22; 2 Cor. vi. 9; Röm. ii. 21, 22, xiii. 9; Off. Joh. xii. 17, xxii. 15): aber das blosse Vermeiden des Unrechts gegen den Nächsten genügt nicht. Die Erfüllung muss geschehen durch die volle Liebe des Nächsten als des Bruders' (Volkmar, p. 65)

[2] Comp. Gal. v. 14, Rom. xiii. 8, xii. 17–21, 1 Cor. xiii. 4–6, with Mark x. 17, xi. 25, 26, xii. 31. Volkmar, pp. 64, 65; Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 618, 619, and esp. 668; Gal. vi. 2; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 348, and *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 24.

[3] Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 12, with Matt. xxv. 40, Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 40, 80; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 217, 218. So, too, Matheson, 'Historical Christ of St. Paul,' in the *Expositor*, i. (2nd series), p. 371; Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 261.

[4] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 33. Comp. Rom. xiii. 1–7 with Matt. xxii. 21. See also Volkmar, *ubi supra*, p. 66, who compares 2 Cor. vi. 4, xii. 12, with Mark xiii. 13 (ὑπομονή; so also 2 Thess. iii. 5); 2 Cor. v. 7 with Mark ix. 23, xi. 22; H. Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 417.

That Christians as such were appointed to suffering is plainly declared 1 Thess. ii. 3 (cf. Acts xiv. 22), and this conception of the Christian lot belonged to the fundamental characteristics which the Lord Himself had ascribed to it in a host of sayings (Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 39).

Prebendary Gibson, in his articles on 'Sources of St. Paul's Teaching' (*Expositor*, vol. iv. p. 38, 2nd series), points out that 1 Tim. vi. 1-3, seems to imply that Paul's teaching on slavery was founded on the express words of the Lord Jesus, and he believes that this passage refers either to some traditional saying, or to such incidents as Luke xii. 14, xx. 25, where Christ directly refused to interfere with existing social arrangements, the very position of Christianity with regard to slavery.

[5] It is very important to notice that Pfleiderer, no less than Volkmar, sees various special points of connection between *Mark* and Paul. We have long been accustomed to hear of instances of connection between Luke and Paul, but the line of argument adopted by Pfleiderer and Volkmar goes far to corroborate the New Testament records of the companionship, not only of Luke and Paul,

Certainly the fact that St. Paul does not more frequently make direct appeals to the words and teaching of Jesus has often occasioned surprise, and provoked discussion. But whilst more than one reasonable explanation may be given of this circumstance,[1] it is well to adduce first of all the positive evidence of the Apostle's knowledge of our Lord's sayings and commands.

At the outset, 'the words of the Lord Jesus,' to which St. Paul so touchingly referred as he bade farewell to the elders of Ephesus, and upon which he claimed to have modelled his own life, will naturally recur to our thoughts.[2] But just as the Apostle introduces this saying for a special purpose, to meet the requirements of the occasion, and to enforce a practical duty, so also it must not be forgotten that the same reasons were at work in his introduction of the account of the Lord's Supper, and in his obvious references to our Lord's eschatological discourses.

If, as Paret reminds us, we only possessed the information that 'the Lord's Supper' was celebrated in the Pauline Churches as in others, this fact in itself would justify the conclusion that the retrospective element of the Pauline Christianity cannot have been so very much over-

but of Mark and Paul. Thus Pfleiderer writes that 'there is no reason for doubting that Mark was found in the immediate society of Paul during his imprisonment in Rome. There is in fact very much to be said in favour of ascribing our second Gospel to this disciple of Paul; for it exhibits plainly various traces of Pauline influences and reminiscences' (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1885, pp. 171 and ff.). See also the remarks of Prof. Estlin Carpenter on the traces of relationship between Mark and Paul, *First Three Gospels*, pp. 292, 294, 2nd edit.; and comp. also Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 395, 396. The passages in the Epistles referred to by Pfleiderer in maintaining the social intercourse between Mark and Paul are: Philemon 24; Col. iv. 10, 11; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

[1] See below, chap. ix.

[2] Acts xx. 35: 'In all things *I gave you an example*, how that so labouring ye ought to help the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he *himself* said "It is more blessed to give than to receive"' (R. V.); Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 48, and Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 62; H. Ewald, *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 160. See also the remarks of Wendt in favour of the authenticity of this saying, *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 345, 346. Amongst English writers Dean Plumptre, *in loco* (Ellicott's *Commentary*, vol. ii. p. 143), Dr. Salmon, *Introduction to the N. T.* p. 95, 5th edit. should be consulted. Comp. also Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 588.

grown, and pressed into the background, by the spiritual, dogmatic, and apocalyptic aspects of it, but that a broad basis of historical evangelical preaching must be presupposed to account for the more didactic explanations of the Apostle in his received Epistles. But the disorders in the Corinthian Church at the festival of the Lord's Supper gave occasion to the Apostle to introduce the history of its institution (1 Cor. xi.): and it is important to remark that he had already done this on an earlier occasion, and that he now repeats what he had formerly said. We have here a proof, not only that his gospel was for the most part an historical narrative and based upon historical events, but that what he so often terms 'my gospel' cannot really be separated in its historical conditions from that of the other Apostles, since the narrative in 1 Cor. xi. is in essential harmony with the first two Gospels, and agrees almost verbally with the third.[1]

But if we bear in mind the fact that this full account of the institution of the Lord's Supper finds a place in 1 Corinthians only because of the abuses which had become connected with it in the Corinthian Church, we may see a reason for the Apostle's frequent references to the sacrament of Baptism without relating the history of its institution. Such an omission may reasonably be attributed to the high estimation which the rite enjoyed amongst the Corinthians, and to the circumstance that no disorders had crept into its celebration, as had been the case with the Lord's Supper, which had its analogy in Grecian *Syssitia* and *Symposia*, and was liable to be corrupted by them.[2] But if Baptism had not been originally an institution of the Lord Jesus, and if Paul had regarded it as of less primitive origin, then we may fairly suppose that he would have relegated it to 'the weak elements of the world' (*ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*), he would never have introduced it into his own Churches, nor would he himself upon occasion have baptised: neither would he have discovered types of it, and in a certain sense even

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 15, 16; see further, chap. vi. 352.
[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 17.

baptism itself, in the Old Testament Scriptures, he would not so reverently have allegorised about it, nor attached to it such deep symbolical and mystical meanings—Rom. vi. 3, 4; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27; see also 1 Cor. i. 17, x. 3 (Ephes. iv. 5)—and baptism would not have been so highly regarded in his Churches. It may be that the relation of baptism to the death of Jesus is a peculiarly Pauline thought, but of this we cannot be sure, and the expression '*or are ye ignorant* (ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε) that all we who were baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into His death?' (Rom. vi. 3) has been held to point in all probability to some generally received Apostolic teaching.[1]

It must not of course be hastily assumed that these arguments of Paret amount to positive proof that Paul was acquainted with the historical institution of Baptism by Jesus, but we are at all events justified in asserting that the Pauline Epistles no less than the Gospels bear witness to the fact that a Church was founded by Christ in which the Lord's Supper was celebrated and to which entrance was ministered by Baptism.[2]

Again, if we turn back to the Apostle's earliest Epistle,

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 16. See also Thenius, p. 66; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 69, and Huraut, p. 22, who after adopting Paret's arguments, and pointing out that although the actual commands of Christ are not quoted, we cannot suppose that baptism would have been introduced into the Pauline Churches unless it had been instituted by Jesus; that its importance is obvious from 1 Cor. xv. 29; that otherwise Paul would not have searched for types of it in the Old Testament, or written as he has in Rom. vi. 3, 4, and in 1 Cor. xii. 13, adds: 'Si l'institution du baptême n'a point été rappelée dans les épitres, c'est que saint Paul n'a point eu l'occasion, cette cérémonie ayant sans doute toujours été entourée de respect.' See also Matheson, *Historical Christ of St. Paul*, vol. ii. (2nd series) pp. 46, 47, on 1 Cor. xv. 29, and 1 Cor. i. 13; and the recent remarks of Nösgen in his *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, pp. 679, 680. So also C. Uhlhorn, *ubi supra*, p. 114.

Keim, in his *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 609, 610, although he throws doubts upon Matt. xxviii. 19, admits that Paul by his estimate of baptism, and by assigning to it the same rank as to the other sign, the Lord's Supper, makes its institution by Jesus very plausible. Keim thinks it probable that Jesus gave the commandment to His disciples to baptise amongst his final commissions on the last evening of His life, and he lays stress upon the fact that Paul reckons baptism amongst the ordinances and means of grace, placing it by the side of the Lord's Supper, the undoubted institution of Jesus, as lending support to this view (1 Cor. x. 2 ff., xii. 13). (See *Geschichte Jesu* [1875], pp. 304, 305.)

[2] In defence of the historical character of Matt. xxviii. 19, and a comparison of it with the formula of baptism given in the Acts, see Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des*

to the Church at Thessalonica, it is evident that the disorderly conduct of some of the members of the Christian community, the restless and morbid excitement, and the anxious questions which arose in prospect of the speedy return of Christ, enable us to understand more clearly the attitude of the Apostle, and his words of special warning and comfort.[1]

But if the Apostle could thus take his stand upon the historical acts and sayings of Jesus in relation to subjects of such vital importance as the atoning death and the future advent of the Lord; and if he could thus bring them to bear without hesitation upon the immediate circumstances and the passing necessities of this Church or of that, it is surely not an unfair inference that it was in his power to have recourse to the same stores of knowledge had other similar occasions demanded. In support of this we proceed to examine two passages which find a place in the *practical* exhortations of the Apostle to the same Church at Corinth—passages which are not so familiar as those previously mentioned, but in which a direct reference to the Gospel sayings of our Lord is admitted even by those who are inclined to minimise the acquaintance of St. Paul with the historical Christ.[2]

In 1 Cor. vii. the Apostle gives his injunctions concerning marriage: and, although we differ so widely from Volk-

N. T. pp. 168, 169, 5. Aufl.; Plumptre, *in loco* (Ellicott's *Commentary*, vol. i. p. 183), as against Harnack, *ubi supra*, i. p. 68, where he asserts, not only that it cannot be proved that Baptism was instituted by Jesus, but, in the most positive manner, that Matt. xxviii. 19 was never spoken by Him.

The remarks also of Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 483, note, may be consulted with advantage. See also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 101, 102, and note, 5. Aufl., although he does not consider that the baptismal formula in Matt. xxviii. 19, belonged to the oldest tradition. It is important to remember that in the *Didaché*, ch. vii., which treats of Baptism, the candidate is to be baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 158, 159.

Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 24, and see further, chap. viii.

[2] Weiss, in *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.*, p. 200, admits that in these two passages, and in these two only (1 Cor. vii. 10, ix. 14), Paul appeals expressly to a word of the Lord; and see the important note of P. Ewald in *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 148. This note and P. Ewald's position and criticism of Dr. Resch, have been already discussed in chap. iii.

mar's general conclusions, it is a beautiful thought of his which connects the command of St. Paul (1 Cor. vii. 10) with our Lord's saying (Mark x. 2–12). As the word *Abba, Father*, strikes the keynote of the new revelation, so in harmony with that 'first word' which tells of God's Fatherhood, 'the second word,' as Volkmar calls it, speaks to us of the sacredness of family life, and of the blessedness of the little children whom Jesus drew to His heart[1] (Mark x. 13, 14).

But nowhere is the distinction so plainly and decisively drawn between what the Apostle determines on his own authority, and what has been already decided by a definite saying of the Lord—between his own opinion (γνώμη) and the command of Christ (ἐπιταγή)[2]—as we here find in 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25. In verses 10, 11, the Apostle appeals to the forbidding of divorce as Christ had spoken in Matt. v. 32, only that what there is forbidden to the man is here extended to the woman also. If we had only the wording of this judgment given us by Matthew and Luke we should certainly be obliged to suppose that as this wider application of it by Paul is so distinctly referred to a saying of Jesus, the Apostle based his deduction upon some fuller form of the tradition in which mention was also made of divorce on the part of the woman; and in Mark x. 12, we find this fuller form actually given. But in the later verse (1 Cor. vii. 25) the Apostle's remark that he had no command concerning virgins is of importance, because it shows us, as Paret forcibly reminds us, how thoroughly he was conscious of dependence upon the historical

[1] Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 64, 75.

[2] This clear distinction made by Paul between a command of the Lord and his own opinion cannot be dismissed as a distinction which only existed in his own consciousness (Baur, *Paulus*, ii. 302).

Amongst those who have emphasised the distinction here drawn between the Apostle's own opinion and the command of Christ, we may refer to Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 58; H. Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 160; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 37; Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 613; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 61, 62; Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 24; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 70; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 16; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 343; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 67; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 24; Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* p. 15; cf. P. Ewald, *ubi supra*; Matheson's 'Historical Christ,' &c., *Expositor*, i. (2nd series) pp. 367 f.

sayings of Jesus: where the Lord had left a matter undecided, where questions, *e.g.*, of discipline were involved, which could not have been determined by Jesus in His earthly life, since they had only become prominent in the course of time, there we find the Apostle placing certain instructions which he gives on his own authority upon a level with those of the Lord (1 Cor. xiv. 37); but where the Lord had already spoken, there the Apostle, as 1 Cor. vii. shows, lays his hand upon his mouth, and only repeats, as an ambassador, the words of his Master.[1] At first sight, indeed, the command which Paul proceeds to give in the subsequent verses (1 Cor. vii. 12–17) is so entirely in accordance with the mind of the historical Christ, the mind of love and peace, it is based upon such reasonable grounds, and is so reasonably applied by Paul, that Paret fails to understand why it also has not been introduced as 'a commandment of the Lord' (ἐπιταγὴ τ. κυρ.). One would have expected that it should have been so introduced, and the only conceivable explanation why this is not the case results from the view that ἐπιταγή signifies the historical words of Jesus which the Apostle had learnt by tradition, and that the historical Christ had said nothing concerning the questions discussed in 1 Cor. vii. 12 and 25. But (as Paret argues) nothing had become known to Paul, because as a matter of fact Jesus in His lifetime had said nothing, about such matters; nor, indeed, had He any occasion to do so, for mixed marriages at any rate were a phenomenon which arose at a later period, and one specially connected with the Pauline Churches.[2]

In a later chapter of the same Epistle (1 Cor. ix. 14) we meet with a passage from a consideration of which the inference seems almost irresistible that we have another citation from the words of the historical Christ. Not only do Weiss and Keim admit the reference, but Hausrath, after speaking of the many *indirect* references compared with the *direct*, to the words of the Lord, remarks in a note, 'A real quotation is in 1 Cor. ix. 14,' and he adds 1 Thess. ii. 6, 'which are founded upon Luke x. 7.' So, too, Schürer is of opinion that

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 37, 38, 56; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 58.

[2] Paret, p. 51.

in 1 Cor. ix. 14, St. Paul is expressly referring to Matt. x. 10 and Luke x. 7.[1]

Upon this passage, which he regards as the clearest reference by Paul to a word once uttered by the Lord, Paret has a long dissertation, which is briefly summarised by Sabatier ('L'Apôtre Paul,' p. 62). The Apostle wishes to establish the right of those who preach the gospel to live of the gospel; he first lays down a 'rational' argument, drawn from the nature of things; then, an illustrative argument, drawn from a word of the law, 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn': 'finally, he completes his proof by citing a positive command of the Lord, 'The Lord commanded,' ὁ κύριος διέταξεν (Matt. x. 10; Luke x. 7): where clearly the word of Jesus forms the last stage in the argument, as being the decisive and supreme authority (comp. Paret, 'Paulus und Jesus,' pp. 36, 44, 45; 1 Cor. ix. verses 4–6, 7, 11–12, 13; 9, 10; 14).

If we look closely at the wording of this remarkable passage, it would seem as if the saying of Christ was present to Paul's mind even to the letter; not only does the word 'gospel,' εὐαγγέλιον, carry us back to the rich treasury of speech which we owe to Jesus, but the expression 'ordained,' διέταξε, is also to be noted: twice previously the Apostle had only spoken of his right, his power, ἐξουσία (verses 4, 12), but now (verse 14) he uses a word (διέταξε, comp. ἐπιταγή, 1 Cor. vii. 25), which is exactly in harmony with the form in which both Matthew and Luke have preserved this injunction of Christ to his first disciples and to the Seventy (Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 7).[2]

[1] Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 348, and *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 27; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 37, 39; Hausrath, *Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 70; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, ii. 259; see also H. Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 172; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 16; Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 386; Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 343, and *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 635; Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 22. See also P. Ewald in his criticism of Resch, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 148, note, also p. 146, where he lays special stress upon this point of contact in 1 Cor. ix. 14, with the Synoptical tradition. For Resch's discussion of the passage, see *Agrapha*, pp. 171, 185 (see above, chap. iii.).

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 36, 37; comp. Volkmar, *ubi supra*, pp. 62, 63, for the word εὐαγγέλιον.

The tense which Paul uses, διέταξε, also seems to point back to a definite

The parallel, too, which Paul draws in the preceding verse (1 Cor. ix. 13) between the service of the Apostles and the service of the Temple (comp. Rom. xv. 16) brings back to our minds the comparison used by our Lord Himself (Matt. xii. 3–6) between the ministry of the Apostles and that of the priests in the Temple.[1]

Nor must it be forgotten that an expression in the next chapter of the Epistle, 1 Cor. x. 27, may to some extent strengthen the conviction that St. Paul must have been closely acquainted with the whole discourse addressed to the Seventy (comp. 1 Cor. x. 27 with Luke x. 8) :[2] and if, indeed, as we have seen reason to believe, the Apostle knew the particular direction given by the Lord to His disciples, as we find it in Matt. x. 10, it is surely not an unfair inference to suppose that he was not ignorant of the other directions enjoined upon them on the same occasion.[3]

occasion when the ordinance was prescribed, as we find to have been actually the case from the narratives of the Evangelists. Huraut's remarks on p. 39, *ubi supra*, embody Paret's arguments quoted in the text.

[1] 'Endlich, ix. 13, stellt er den Dienst der Apostel in Parallele mit dem Tempeldienst (vgl. Röm. xv. 16), was ein auffallende, von keinem Ausleger bemerkte Aehnlichkeit mit Matth. xiii. 3–6 darbietet, wo Jesus selbst den Dienst der Apostel mit dem der Priester im Tempel vergleicht' (Paret, p. 37). Comp. Huraut, p. 32 : 'Saint Paul (1 Cor. ix. 13) met le ministère des Apôtres en parallèle avec celui du temple ; voyez aussi Rom. xv. 16, ce qui offre une ressemblance assez grande avec Matt. xii. 3–6, où Jésus rapproche le ministère des apôtres de celui des prêtres.'

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 40 ; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70 ; comp. *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 23. This passage, 1 Cor. x. 27, is one upon which Steck chiefly relies in support of his position that the writer of the Epistle was dependent on Luke (*Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 203–208). But, as Gloël observes, the expression 'Eat what is set before you' is not so peculiar as to prevent two authors using it independently, especially when we remember that the words in the Epistle and the Gospel are not verbally the same, and that they occur in two different connections. Dr. Salmon, in commenting on the connection between 1 Cor. x. 27 and Luke x. 8, remarks : 'If the coincidence is more than accidental, I should ascribe it to the adoption as his own, by St. Paul, of well-known words of our Lord' (*Introd.* p. 329). But, as Dr. Salmon points out, this passage is no proof that Luke, when he wrote, had seen the Epistles to the Corinthians, as Holtzmann argues, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 401, 2. Aufl. 1886. For a further consideration of the connection between St. Luke and St. Paul, see below, p. 325 ff.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 36. On Paret's view that 1 Cor. ix. 10 also contains a word of Jesus, see *ubi supra*, p. 45, and Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 171.

'Kannte Paulus diese einzelne den Aposteln für ihre künftige Amtsführung

But further: such a passage as 1 Cor. ix, 14, may show us how St. Paul, in describing his labour in the Gospel, reproduced the very imagery which his Lord had used: to plant a vineyard, to feed a flock, to sow, to reap, to plough, all these figures of speech which St. Paul employs in describing the work of the ministry (1 Cor. ix. 1–4) are familiar to us in the words and sayings of the Jesus of the Evangelists (comp., *e.g.*, 1 Cor. ix. 7, 10, and Luke xvii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 10, and Luke ix. 62),[1] and as we review these frequent instances of similarity between St. Paul's language and the Gospels, we may well be reminded of the remarks of Holtzmann, that the Church had in the carefully preserved 'sayings of the Lord' a kind of fundamental law (comp. Paul's expression 'this I say unto you as a word of the Lord,' 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, ix. 14, xi. 24, 25), and in the sayings of Jesus, with their effective expressiveness and their homely clearness—words, which once heard would linger in the memory for ever: 'Blessed are the pure in heart': 'Ye are the salt of the earth'; 'Let your conversation be Yea, yea'—words which in the Sermon on the Mount are strung together like pearls.[2] To such sayings we may add those parables of transparent crystal clearness, as Holtzmann calls

von Jesu gegebene Anweisung, so waren ihm die übrigen, wie wir sie etwa Matth. x. 10 lesen, gewiss auch nicht unbekannt' (Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 36).

'Si saint Paul a connu cette indication si particulière donnée, Matt. x. 10, par Jésus aux Apôtres pour leur vocation future, est-il probable qu'il ait ignoré les autres recommandations qui leur sont encore faites dans le même chapitre? Tout le contenu ne doit-il pas lui en avoir été parfaitement connu?' (Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 38.)

[1] 'On remarquera, en outre, dans tout ce passage (1 Cor. ix. 1–14), les images sous lesquelles Paul désigne le labeur évangélique; ce sont les mêmes dont Jésus aimait à se servir: φυτέυειν ἀμπελῶνα, ποιμαίνειν ποίμνην, σπείρειν, θερίζειν, ἀροτριᾶν' (Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 62).

After comparing 1 Cor. ix. 13 with Matt. xii. 3-6, Paret adds: 'Diese eigenthümliche Auffassung des apostolischen Berufes, sowie ohne Zweifel das vorangehende ἀροτριᾶν (1 Cor. ix. 10; vgl. mit Luk. ix. 62, xvii. 7), scheinen auf ursprüngliche Gedanken und Worte Jesu selbst zurückzudeuten; ebenso erinnert das Bild von ποιμαίνειν, 1 Cor. ix. 7, an Luk. xvii. 7' (p. 37). To the same effect also Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 32; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70; Roos, *ubi supra*, pp. 59, 60; and for similar instances Wittichen also, *Leben Jesu*, p. 50.

[2] Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 15, 1889.

them, so abundantly found in our Gospels, inexhaustible sources of the purest consciousness of God and of the world ; parables of such an inimitable simplicity, of such an artless sublimity of conception, of such an inspiring colouring, as to assure them to all eternity a place at the head of all written remains which point out to an inquiring humanity the way to its divine goal.[1]

But is it not possible (while reserving the consideration of the obvious references in the Epistles to the words of the Lord in His last discourses) to add to the list of those sayings of Jesus 'which once heard would linger in the memory for ever'?

It may be readily admitted that such references are not so direct in the Epistles of St. Paul as in the Epistle of St. James or in the Apocalypse, but if they are considered on the whole,[2] they may help to strengthen the belief that the Apostle was more widely acquainted with our Lord's teaching than might appear at first sight to have been the case. Take, *e.g.*, the two familiar images which immediately succeed each other in the Sermon on the Mount (and to one of which Holtzmann refers in the above passage), 'Ye are the salt of the earth'; 'Ye are the light of the world': Ewald reminds us[3] how they are both reproduced by St. Paul, one in the Epistle to the Philippians (ii. 15), the other in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv. 6). It is also worthy of remark that in the same exhortation to the Philippians the Apostle bids them to be 'harmless' (ἀκέραιοι), and in so doing he reproduces, as Neander observes,[4] the very word used by our Lord in His charge to the disciples (Matt. x. 16)—a word only found in one other passage in the New Testament, which also plainly reminds us of our Lord's command, and which we again owe to St. Paul (Rom. xvi. 19). Certainly such a characteristic as that which is attributed to faith in 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 'and if I have all faith *so*

[1] Holtzmann, *ubi supra*, i. 15.

[2] Reuss, *ubi supra*, p. 227, admits, and quotes, similar reminiscences in 1 Peter. Comp. also Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 433.

[3] Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 446, 492 ; comp. also Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 45.

[4] Neander, *Life of Christ*, E. T. p. 299.

as to remove mountains,' *may* be accounted for by saying that St. Paul is merely reproducing an ordinary Jewish proverb. Paret in discussing the connection of this expression with our Lord's sayings, admits this ('Paulus und Jesus,' p. 40), but, on the other hand, it may be noted that Ewald, Hausrath, Thenius, Sabatier, Huraut, all connect this verse with our Lord's own familiar illustration of the power of faith (Matt xvii. 20; xxi. 21).[1] Hausrath also points out how the imagery of the blind leading the blind in Matt. xv. 14 (which again may be derived from some familiar proverb) is exactly reproduced in Rom. ii. 19,[2] and the imagery in 2 Cor. xi. 2 appears to him to be connected, not only with Matt. ix. 15, but also with our Lord's parable in Matt. xxv. 1–12.[3]

We are also frequently reminded of a special connection between the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of St. Luke—a connection which we might fairly expect, and which is naturally accounted for, if Paul and Luke, as there is every reason to believe, were companions and fellow-labourers. If indeed we looked no further than the two accounts of the institution of the Eucharist given us in 1 Cor. and Luke xxii., we must remember that whatever difficulties they may present in detail, and although the agreement between them does not extend to every word, yet many writers have risen from their examination with the conviction that these two accounts are alone sufficient to establish the connection between Paul and the third Evangelist.[4]

[1] Ewald, *Sendschreiben*, p. 198; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 45; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 62; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 31.

[2] Hausrath, *ubi supra*, iii. So too Paret, p. 40; Huraut, p. 31.

[3] Hausrath, *ibid.*; but comp. Plumptre, *in loco* (Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.* ii. 401).

[4] See below, chap. vi. p. 352.

On the different views which may be taken of the literary connection between St. Paul and St. Luke, comp. Salmon, *Introd.* p. 320; Godet, *Commentaire sur l'Évangile de St. Luc*, pp. 31–36; Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 399, 2. Aufl. 1886; Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.*, edited by Mangold, 1886, pp. 147, 163; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 77–83.

Dean Stanley, in his essay, referred to in chap. ii., remarks of the references in 1 and 2 Cor. to the Gospel History, that they almost all, so far as they refer to one Gospel narrative rather than another, agree with that of St. Luke

In the literature of this subject two of Holtzmann's learned works occupy a very prominent place. Holtzmann has drawn up a very lengthy and exhaustive list of parallels between the Lucan Gospel and the Pauline Epistles, from which he would derive an argument for the dependence of the former upon the latter.[1] On the other hand, it has been

. . . . even words and phrases have a relation to Luke's Gospel so intimate as to require some explanation ; and there is no reason, he adds, why we should not adopt the account anciently received, that the author or compiler of that Gospel was the companion of St. Paul. For similarly striking instances of the relationship between Paul and Luke, see Plumptre, *Commentary on the N. T.* (Cassell) vol. i. Introd. pp. 29, 30. Amongst other instances Dean Plumptre notes Paul's use of the adverb ἀπεριισπάστως, which is taken from St. Luke's account of Martha as 'cumbered' (περιεσπᾶτο) about much serving (1 Cor. vii. 35 ; Luke x. 40 ; comp. the stress laid by Dean Stanley, and by the Bishop of Derry, *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 21, upon this same parallel) ; comp. also Godet's remarks upon Paul's adoption of the remarkable word ἀθετεῖ, 'rejecteth,' although the Apostle was not himself of the number of the Twelve, a word not found elsewhere in the first three Gospels (1 Thess. iv. 8 ; Luke x. 16). Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 652 ; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 40 ; Thenius, *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, p. 45. We may also refer to Prebendary Gibson's articles on 'Sources of St. Paul's Teaching' (*Expositor*, vol. iv. 2nd series, pp. 38, 40, 42, 43, 44), where he finds special points of connection between Paul and Luke's Gospel : *e.g.* 1 Tim. vi. 13 and Luke xii. 14, xx. 25 ; 1 Thess. v. 1–8 and Luke xxi. 34–36 ; Rom. xii. 13 and Luke vi. 27 ; Rom. xiii. 7 and Luke xx. 35, xxiii. 2 ; 1 Tim. v. 18 and Luke x. 7 ; 2 Tim. ii. 24–26 and Luke v. 10.

[1] See *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 322–324, and *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 401. The list of parallels given by Holtzmann in the former work is as follows : Luke iv. 22—Col. iv. 6. Luke iv. 32—1 Cor. ii. 4. Luke vi. 36—2 Cor. i. 3 ; Rom. xii. 1. Luke vi. 37—Rom. ii. 1 ; cf. xiv. 4. Luke vi. 39—Rom. ii. 19. Luke vi. 48—1 Cor. iii. 10. Luke viii. 15—Col. i. 10, 11. Luke ix. 56—2 Cor. x. 8. Luke x. 8—1 Cor. x. 27. Luke x. 20 - Phil. iv. 3. Luke x. 21—1 Cor. i. 19. Luke xi. 22—Col. ii. 15. Luke xi. 36—Ephes. v. 13. Luke xi. 41—Tit. i. 15. Luke xi. 49—1 Thess. ii. 15. Luke xii. 2, 3—1 Cor. iv. 5. Luke xii. 35—Ephes. vi. 14. Luke xii. 42—1 Cor. iv. 1, 2 ; the word οἰκονόμος only occurring in Paul and Luke (cf. xvi. 1) with the sole exception of 1 Pet. iv. 10. Luke xiii. 36—1 Cor. viii. 8. Luke xviii. 1—2 Thess. i. 11. Col. iv. 12 ; cf. 1 Thess. v. 17 ; Rom. i. 10. Luke xx. 16—Rom. ix. 14, xi. 11 ; Gal. iii. 21. Luke xx. 17, 18—Rom. ix. 33. Luke xx. 38—Rom. xiv. 7, 8 ; cf. 2 Cor. v. 15. Luke xxi. 19—Rom. ii. 7 ; cf. 2 Cor. i. 6, vi. 4. Luke xxi. 24—Rom. xi. 25. Luke xxi. 34—1 Thess. v. 3–8 ; cf. Rom. xiii. 11–14. Luke xxi. 36—Ephes. vi. 18, 2 Cor. v. 10 ; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 19. Amongst English writers a long list of words and phrases common to St. Paul and St. Luke is given by Dr. Davidson in his *Introd. to the N. T.* ii. 12–19, and a selection of them will be found in Dr. Farrar's *Messages of the Books*, p. 76.

With regard to Holtzmann's theory of the dependence of Luke upon the Pauline Epistles, Dr. Salmon considers it probable that when the Evangelist wrote he had not seen the Epistles to the Corinthians. The strongest token, as he calls

strongly urged that these parallels by no means prove the use and knowledge of Pauline Epistles. Thus B. Weiss remarks, with special reference to Holtzmann, that all which has been said in favour of such use, even that which is to some extent probable (Luke x. 8, comp. with 1 Cor. x. 27; xii. 35 with Ephes. vi. 14; xviii. 1 with 2 Thess. i. 11; xxi. 34 with 1 Thess. v. 3), amounts simply to this, that Luke's mode of expression shows a certain relationship with the Pauline, which surely cannot be strange in the case of a companion of Paul; even the agreement between Luke xxiv. 34 and 1 Cor. xv. 5, which Weiss admits to be striking, does not prove, in his opinion, that Paul himself supplied Luke with his historical material.[1] But Weiss readily admits the Pauline character of Luke's Gospel, and speaks of Luke's account of the Last Supper as blending the Pauline account with that of Mark.[2]

If, however, the comparisons between Luke's Gospel and 1 Corinthians were so very obvious and numerous as Holtzmann maintains, it is strange that Steck does not make more of his argument for the dependence of 1 Corinthians upon St. Luke, especially when he had every interest to do so. Certainly Steck does not take account of 1 Thessalonians, which presents us with such a close and striking parallel between Paul's words and our Lord's great eschatological discourse (comp. 1 Thess. v. and Luke xxi.). But even if we do not adopt the view that a common document was used by Luke and Paul, is it very unreasonable to believe that such a discourse would be widely known by oral tradition, especially when we remember that the primitive Church naturally had its gaze fixed upon the return of the Lord and the signs of His coming? And if, as Holtzmann himself

it, that has been found of indebtedness on Luke's part to Pauline Epistles, viz. in the close resemblance between the words of Institution in 1 Cor. and Luke's Gospel, Dr. Salmon is inclined to explain by the liturgical use of the words: with reference to the similar phrase in 1 Cor. x. 27 and Luke x. 8, Dr. Salmon ascribes the coincidence, if it is more than accidental, to the adoption as his own, by St. Paul, of well-known words of our Lord (*Introd. to the N. T.* pp. 319, 320, 5th edit. 1891.

[1] *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 555, 2. Aufl. 1889. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 554, 555.

maintains, there is no necessity to suppose that Luke employed 1 Corinthians in his account of the Last Supper, but simply depended upon 'the preaching of Paul' (*κήρυγμα Παύλου*), in which the account of that Supper had received a fixed form,[1] why should not a dependence upon the same source explain the Evangelist's acquaintance with the great discourse on the Mount of Olives?

No doubt what is called Luke's 'universalism' which shows itself in such sayings as Luke xiii. 30, xiv. 22, xxiv. 47, in the parables of xv. and xviii. 1–14, in such incidents as those narrated in xix. 1–10, xxiii. 43, confirms the Pauline doctrines of free grace and universal redemption,[2] but here again what more likely than that Luke the companion and friend of Paul should have selected from the materials which lay before him those portions of the life and teaching of Jesus which would best recommend the two great Pauline principles?[3]

But when we use the expression Luke's 'Paulinism' let us remember that there is a sense in which it may be truly said that the Paulinism of the third Evangelist is neither more nor less than that of Jesus Himself: it has its roots, not in the teaching of Paul, but in that of Jesus. In the teaching and work of the Saviour both the so-called Judaic and Pauline elements found a place, and Paul in developing the two principles of a free and universal salvation only extended, says Godet, the sides of an angle already drawn by Jesus Himself.[4] In this third Gospel, *e.g.*, which is said to possess an anti-Judaic tendency, and to have been directed against the Twelve, we see not only Jesus represented as the son of David (xviii. 38, xx. 41), the theocratic king (xix. 38), but salvation des-

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396.

[2] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 551, 2. Aufl. 1889.

[3] Godet, *Commentaire sur l'Evangile de St. Luc*, p. 32. On the manner in which Paul's teaching had its germ in the sayings and parables of Jesus, see the interesting remarks of Neander in his *Life of Christ*, E. T. pp. 89, 93, 95, 108, 217, 312, 386, and especially in connection with St. Luke's Gospel see pp. 199, 233.

[4] Godet, *ubi supra*, pp. 35, 36. Comp. also Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 401.

tined in the first place for Israel (xiii. 16, xix. 9), and the Twelve Apostles appointed for the twelve tribes of Israel (xxii. 30).[1]

But there still remains one most important question for our consideration. Is it possible to establish any points of connection between the teaching of the Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of St. John? A fresh interest and importance has been given to this question by the recent work of Paul Ewald.[2] But it is fair to remember that the subject had not altogether escaped the attention of other critics. It is not only that in Paret[3] and Sabatier we find a distinct recognition of the mystical element common to St. John and the first three Gospels, but P. Ewald's argument has been already to some extent anticipated by Dr. Matheson in his 'Historical Christ of St. Paul.'[4] All students who are interested in

[1] Weiss, *ubi supra*, pp. 551, 552, note. Against the view that St. Luke's Gospel was written with a 'tendency' to degrade the Twelve, see Weiss, *ibid.* p. 553, Godet, *ubi supra*, pp. 22, 32, 39, and the theory rejected by Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 400, 401, 2. Aufl. 1886.

[2] *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, 1890.

[3] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 73; comp. Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 51, and 259, 260.

[4] Comp. *e.g.* 'The Historical Christ of St. Paul' in *Expositor*, vol. i. (2nd series) pp. 193–199, and vol. ii. pp. 137–143. We may select from these striking pages Dr. Matheson's comments on Rom. vii. 4, with which he compares our Lord's own use of the figure of the bridegroom in the Synoptists (comp. also Paret's remarks, *ubi supra*, on the same figure and its connection with St. John's phraseology): 'It becomes more and more impossible that St. Paul could have uttered these words if the atmosphere called Johannine were not already around him, if the conception of the fourth Gospel had not been involved in the earliest vision of Christianity. Nor does it seem to us a likely supposition that he would have ventured on a metaphor so bold, if there had not been ringing in his ears an echo from the words of the Master which seemed to warrant it. If he knew as an historical fact that the Master had called Himself "the Bridegroom," or if he was familiar with such parabolic references as we meet with in the Synoptic Gospels, we can well understand his language; if he was the inventor of that language he must have transcended in a remarkable degree all traces of his Judaic birth and education. The whole passage sounds like Johannine thought expressed in Synoptic symbolism. It singularly unites the elements of two generations. It breathes the atmosphere of profound mysticism, and as such it anticipates the spirit of the fourth Evangelist; it employs the metaphor of familiar daily life, and as such it re-echoes the spirit of an earlier day. On the very lowest computation, it may with confidence be affirmed that, if there were an historical Christ who united in His own person the characteristics of the first three

New Testament criticism may well be thankful to Dr. Sanday for directing attention to Ewald's book, and more especially that portion of it which deals with the Johannean question.[1] The bold position taken up by Ewald in maintaining that there was not only a Synoptic but a Johannean tradition in the early Church is supported by arguments of singular force and interest.[2]

It might perhaps be argued with some plausibility that if the historical tradition peculiar to the fourth Gospel was of so much value and importance, it is strange that few distinct notices of it are found in the Epistles. But Ewald maintains that so far as the historical tradition is

Gospels with the spirit of the fourth, the natural outcome of such a union would be the passage before us' (vol. i. *ubi supra*, pp. 198, 199).

A valuable exposition of the points of connection in the teaching of St. John and St. Paul will be found in *Scientific Bases of Faith*, by Mr. J. J. Murphy, and a summary of them is given by Dr. Salmon, *Introd.* p. 202. See also the following pages in Mr. Murphy's work, 391–395, 418, and Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, pp. 252, 257, 261, 264, 265, 273, 275, 4th edit. Comp. Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 516–524, 3. Aufl. 1885; and see P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 89, as against Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 452 ff. 2. Aufl.

[1] *Expositor*, March 1891, pp. 182 ff.

[2] See, *e.g.*, P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, pp. 11, 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, 24, 35, 36, and 150, 151, and many other passages.

In a note on p. 58 Ewald refers to the book of Fr. Roos, entitled *Der Apostel Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, 1887, which, as he admits, is the only place in which he has found a real treatment of the points of connection between the Johannine tradition and the New Testament Epistles, inasmuch as other treatises have been so confined to the consideration of the Synoptic material only. Ewald, however, at the same time reminds us that Roos is writing with a different object from himself, and he speaks of the sifting necessary in Roos' uncritical accumulation of material. But it is to be remembered that in Ewald's own pages we frequently find stress laid upon the same passages as in the treatise of Roos: comp. *e.g.* Roos, pp. 40, 41—Ewald, p. 85; Roos, p. 46—Ewald, p. 91; Roos, p. 64—Ewald, p. 88; Roos, pp. 97, 98—Ewald, p. 81; and although, no doubt, some points of connection between Paul and John which Roos emphasise may appear fanciful, his pages are full of suggestiveness and interest, and of apologetic value in their summaries of the arguments for the authenticity of the various New Testament Epistles; his work is recently referred to by Nösgen in his *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 22. In addition to the few instances given above, the following pages of Roos' work may be consulted in their bearing upon Pauline and Johannine phraseology: pp. 45, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 98, 101, 102, 138, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 222, 240, &c. See also Thenius, *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, p. 45.

concerned the Pauline Epistles introduce a certain number of facts common to both types of tradition—the Synoptic and the Johannean—and the real result is, not that Paul shows as good as nothing of the Johannean tradition and very much of the Synoptical, but that he recognises material which may be described as material equally common to all four Gospels.[1] To illustrate this statement Ewald refers to such facts as the betrayal (1 Cor. xi. 23), the revilings (Rom. xv. 3), the wood of the cross (Gal. vi. 14), the nailing to the cross (Col. ii. 14), the burial (1 Cor. xv. 4) with special features.

In addition to these facts common to both traditions we have the institution of the Lord's Supper peculiar to the Synoptists, and possibly a few special incidents peculiar to St. John: even if it is asserted that Paul shows a special acquaintance with many facts which belong to the material contained in the Synoptists, yet this would not exclude an acquaintance with, and the use of, the subject-matter of the fourth Gospel. And if we admit St. Paul's knowledge of many of the facts certified by the Synoptists, such facts, *e.g.*, as those referred to by Paret or Keim or Wittichen, including the descent, the birth, and circumcision of Jesus, or the naming of the Twelve, or the high value set upon baptism, Ewald reminds us that some of these facts are just as much founded upon the Johannean tradition as upon the Synoptical, and are assumed to be generally understood (comp., *e.g.*, John ii. 5, *ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ*, John iv. 9 ff. *σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὤν—ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*).

But whilst Ewald frankly concludes that the facts which may be derived from the Johannean tradition are very few in number,[2] he maintains that what is wanting to his argu-

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, pp. 77, 78, and note.

[2] So far as the *historical facts* of the life of Jesus are concerned, Ewald points out that there are only three in all the rich literature of the Pauline Epistles which can be described as specifically Johannine, viz. 1 Tim. vi. 13; 1 Cor. v. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 7, and even with regard to these, the first two might be regarded as contained in the Synoptic tradition, while the third is based upon Resch's assumed identification of James and Thomas in John xx. 24 ff. (*Das Hauptproblem*, p. 77).

ment in this respect may be supplemented if we can find in Paul's Epistles, as in the case of the Epistles of James and Peter, a series of references to positive words and discourses of Jesus which the fourth Gospel presents to us—words and discourses which, in some cases at least, cannot possibly be separated from their accompanying incidents.[1]

It must of course be remembered that Ewald's position is not that such coincidences prove the existence of a written fourth Gospel, but of a Johannean tradition; and just as Dr. B. Weiss has shown that the 'Didaché'[2] is replete with Johannean ideas and expressions, so Ewald's argument goes to show that the same kind of Johannean thoughts and phraseology must have been at a very early date current in the Church. *No criticism can expect to prove more than this: and to be able to prove as much as this is to take an important step towards refuting the theory that the teaching of the Christ of the fourth Gospel is an after-growth of the second century.*

Ewald commences with the Epistles of St. James and 1 Peter, from each of which he is able to adduce many passages in support of his position.[3] He is quite prepared to accept each of these Epistles as genuine, and to regard the former 'with an ever-increasing number of inquirers' as the oldest document in the New Testament. At the same time he expressly says that he does not feel called upon to defend these two Epistles at any length, because with regard to the Epistle of St. James it is evident that in any case, even upon the supposition of its entire spuriousness, it must be regarded as older than the fourth Gospel and independent of it.[4] So, too, with regard to 1 Peter, whilst he rejects the early date demanded by B. Weiss and Kühl, he holds that nothing vital depends upon the acceptance or rejection of their position, since a knowledge of the fourth Gospel on the part of the writer of 1 Peter is in any case excluded.[5]

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 78.

[2] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 32, 2. Aufl. 1889. See vol. i. E. T. pp. 42, 43.

[3] Pp. 58-67 and 68-75.

[4] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 58 and note.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 68 and note.

In the same way Ewald considers himself entitled to appeal, not only to the recognised *Hauptbriefe*, but to the other Pauline Epistles, because, in the first place, he is of opinion that more satisfactory arguments should be forthcoming to justify their rejection, and in the next place, and chiefly, because even if we assume that they are not genuine, the result of his discussions would not be subjected to any essential modification. As in the case of the Epistles of James and 1 Peter, so here, too, there is no room for the supposition that a considerable portion of the Pauline literature was post-Johannine and composed under the influence of the Gospel of John: such a position has seldom been seriously maintained even with regard to the Pastoral Epistles. The only difference in the present argument would be that a fraction of the proof passages must be referred, not to Paul himself, but to some representative of the Pauline school, and the passages in question would still remain as independent witnesses of the historic character of the Johannine account.[1]

As considerable ground has to be covered in tracing the references in the Pauline Epistles to Johannean sayings and discourses, Ewald thinks it best to start from the Gospel and to take the chapters in order.[2]

Until we reach the third chapter, Ewald admits that it must remain undecided whether there can be found Pauline parallels which are more than parallels, and which prove any application by Paul of what is related in the fourth Gospel. We might, *e.g.*, argue that the expression 'the Lamb of God' in the mouth of the Baptist reminded us of 1 Cor. v. 7, and that in the Pauline universalism we have an echo of 'the taking away of the sin of the world,' but since it is not proved that the passage in the fourth Gospel is to be understood of the Paschal Lamb, we cannot maintain that 1 Cor. v. 7 contains any reference to the fourth Gospel.

But we are able, Ewald thinks, to find in the Pauline Epistles a whole series of reminiscences of ch. iii. To do justice to Ewald's argument, we must remember that he has already dwelt upon the close connection between the opening

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 76 and note. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 79-95.

verses of John iii. and James i. 17, 18, and that he claims to have established the acquaintance of James with Christ's conversation with Nicodemus. But in the Pauline Epistles he further claims to have discovered reminiscences of the same conversation and of the same familiar phraseology. The first passage which naturally occurs to us is Titus iii. 4, and here, he thinks, we have not only the general conception of 'regeneration' as a point of connection with John iii. 1, &c., but when we consider the whole context, is it not as if we could read between the lines, and see Nicodemus enter into the presence of the new teacher sent from God who had appeared before his eyes, with the tacit inquiry 'What works of righteousness did the Lord expect from him?' as if one heard how Jesus referred him to the birth from above, which truly could not be effected by any human means, but which must proceed from the Holy Ghost, and through which, so to say, flesh is renewed to spirit.

All this will doubtless seem to many minds somewhat fanciful, and Ewald's next point will probably carry more weight when he reminds us how the expression in Titus iii. 5, 'the washing of regeneration' contains both the factors mentioned in John iii. 3. In Ephes. v. 26 we have 'the washing,' but not the birth; in 1 Peter and James we have the birth, but not the washing: but the two are united in Titus iii. 5, a union only found elsewhere in John iii. 3, 'to be born of water' (*γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος*). In Titus iii. 5 the mention of the Spirit and its renewing power reminds us of John iii. 4, for in Ewald's opinion the word *ἄνωθεν* (John iii. 3), though rightly translated 'from above,' implies a thorough renewal, a radical change of life, and, carrying on his points of connection, Ewald further notices that the result of the washing and renewing in Titus afford a close parallel with the result of the new birth in the Gospel (comp. Titus iii. 7 and John iii. 5 and 16).

From these details Ewald prefers to draw an argument, not for the literary dependence of the author of this Epistle upon the fourth Gospel, but for the existence of a living Johannean tradition to which the author of the Epistle referred;

and this conclusion he supports by reminding us that there is good reason for believing that the tradition of the narrative contained in John iii. was already well known : comp. James i. 18 and 1 Peter i. 23.

But the points of connection need by no means be confined to the first group of conceptions in chapter iii. In verse 6 we have two other conceptions by the side of that of the new birth, viz. 'the flesh' and 'the spirit.' It may be said that these words are not here used in the full meaning of the Pauline terminology, but at any rate we find ourselves on the way to the Pauline statements, and it becomes at the outset probable that the words of Jesus concerning the birth of the flesh and of the spirit were known to Paul, and that they influenced his terminology. This probability, Ewald believes, becomes a certainty when we compare Rom. viii. 7 and 8 with John iii. 5, 6. Here, again, it must be admitted that the points of connection are of a very general kind, and it is not so certain, as Ewald thinks, that the Pauline expression 'they that are in the flesh cannot please God' at once brings to the mind the word of Jesus that he that is born of the flesh 'cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' But further : in the same chapter (Rom. viii.), and in the same connection of thought, Paul speaks of the confident belief of the Christian : he appeals to the fact that God has not spared His own Son (*ἴδιος υἱός*), but delivered him up (*παρέδωκεν*) for us all (verse 32), and he sees here a proof of the love of God (verse 39 : *ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ*) : it follows that in the case of believers there is no one who accuses them, no one who condemns them. Here, again, Ewald maintains that we can hear Jesus saying in the same conversation with Nicodemus : 'God so loved (*ἠγάπησεν*) the world that He gave His only-begotten Son (*μονογενῆ*)'—we can hear Him explaining that he who believes on Him is not judged (*οὐ κρίνεται*) : so, too, we may compare Rom. viii. 3 with John iii. 17, and from these various points of connection we need no further proof that Paul when he wrote Rom. viii. lived in the thoughts of the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus.

But, quite apart from this manifest dependence upon a

particular narrative, Ewald finds in the same chapter of the Romans still further proofs of Paul's acquaintance with the Johannean discourses of Christ. In verse 1 the expression 'those that are *in Christ Jesus*' (εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ) reminds us of John xv. 4 ff.; in verse 10 the expression 'Christ in you' (Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν) of John xvii. 23 &c.: again in verse 2 'hath freed me' (ἠλευθέρωσέν με) reminds us of John viii. 31, &c., and with Paul's whole view of the indwelling and working of the Spirit, the Spirit of Christ in man, verse 9 ff., verse 26 ff., we may compare, amongst many passages, John xiv. 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13, vii. 31.

One more point of connection between Paul and this third chapter of the fourth Gospel Ewald thinks may possibly be found in the striking expression 'whom he hath *set forth*,' *i.e.* exhibited openly (ὃν προέθετο: Rom. iii. 25), which carries us back to the thought of the Son of Man who must be *lifted up* (ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ) John iii. 14, just as the serpent in the wilderness was lifted up before the whole camp: this connection Ewald supports by the fact that in each passage faith is spoken of as the means of appropriating the Saviour; comp. Rom. iii. 25 with John iii. 16 (διὰ πίστεως—ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων). But here again the connection seems somewhat forced, and it may be questioned whether the middle voice προέθετο conveys the meaning which Ewald attaches to it.[1]

In John iv. Ewald believes that we may read another special reminiscence of Paul. In verse 21 of this chapter we have the one passage in which lie nearly all the elements of the Pauline Universalism. 'Salvation' indeed 'is of the Jews' (verse 19 comp. with Rom. iii. 1 ff. ix. 4 ff.). But 'the hour cometh when ye shall neither in Gerizim nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father' (verse 21), with which we may compare St. Paul's language, 'there is neither Jew nor Greek' (Gal. iii 28; Col. iii. 11). 'And this hour now is' (verse 23)—so Paul can say that *in Christ Jesus there is no longer* Jew nor Greek, through him the partition wall is removed (*ibid.* and Ephes. ii. 14). Moreover, this hour is characterised by the dispensation of the Spirit: men 'worship in spirit and in

[1] Comp. Humphry, *Commentary on the R. V.* p. 269.

truth' (John), comp. 2 Cor. iii. 6. Ewald grants that it might be possible to explain these points of agreement without supposing the literary dependence of Paul upon the Evangelist—for this, the expression is too independent—but by what might be called an accidental agreement of view on the part of two writers, whose theological tendencies were, in general, concordant. Ewald himself is evidently not prepared to accept the latter explanation, but he insists that in any case one must recognise that Paul's words absolutely presuppose an acquaintance with explanations of Jesus *similar* to those which he offers to the woman of Samaria in John iv.: how otherwise in the question as to the validity of his 'universalism' could Paul have been so confident, as he doubtless was, of his agreement with the will of Christ? At the very least Paul's words furnish us with an indirect confirmation of the narrative in John iv. 19 ff.

John v. contains, in Ewald's opinion, many sayings of Jesus which produce upon us a very distinct impression that we have in them the source from which the Pauline Christology received its normal direction, but he does not offer any actual proof in support of this view.

In John vi. Ewald dwells at length upon a remarkable parallel between verse 26 and a conception which meets us twice in the two Epistles which are probably the earliest of those which bear Paul's name, 1 Thess. i. 3, 2 Thess. i. 11, *the work of faith* (ἔργον τῆς πίστεως). This Pauline conception is a very striking one, because it is evidently regarded, not in the sense of an activity proceeding from belief, but in the sense of an activity consisting in belief itself. From whence did Paul derive it? Not, Ewald thinks, from his own consciousness: he employed it because he had received it, but later he discontinued its use when he saw that it was misunderstood. But if this is so, then Ewald maintains that the source of the conception could be no other than the answer contained in John vi. 29, an answer easily retainable by tradition: the Jews ask what they must do to work the works of God, and Jesus replies, 'This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he hath sent' (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ ἔργον

τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος). Ewald considers that the reference here is quite clear, and that however insignificant, it is yet full of significance, since the expression is so decidedly foreign to Paul's general usage.

Passing on to ch. viii., Ewald notices first of all the evident parallel between verse 34 and Rom. vi. 16. 'He that committeth sin is the servant of sin,' says Jesus (πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας): 'To whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of sin unto death,' says Paul. But further: Paul gives thanks that his readers have left behind them the season of slavery unto sin and have become obedient from the heart—not first to righteousness—but to that form of teaching to which they were delivered (verse 17). It is a striking coincidence to Ewald's mind, that here also we have a point of contact with that same conversation between Jesus and the believing Jews. There, too, the condition of becoming free is that one enters into a relation of obedience to a teaching, that one abides in the word of Jesus, and thus learns to know the truth. So, too, Paul's expression 'from the heart' (ἐκ καρδίας)[1] corresponds to the terms 'to abide' (μένειν) and 'truly' (ἀληθῶς) in John; so, too, we may note in addition Paul's expression 'and the end everlasting life' (τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴ αἰώνιος) (verses 23 and 24), to which the words in the fourth Gospel correspond, 'the Son abideth for ever' (ὁ υἱὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα).

Certainly in Paul the thought receives quite a peculiar turn, inasmuch as he speaks of 'a being enslaved to righteousness' (δουλωθῆναι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ), but Ewald does not maintain that Paul must have followed the exact words of the Lord, and it is, he thinks, after all possible that the original form of the conversation narrated in the Gospel might have had a secondary reference, tending in the direction of the phraseology adopted by Paul. But the most important consideration of all lies in the fact that this passage in the

[1] Comp. also James I. 25; *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 87.

For points of connection between this chapter and St. John's Gospel, see also Ewald, *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 388, 389, 393.

Romans is not the only one which renders clear the acquaintance of Paul with the conversation in John v. In Gal. v. we may instance verse 1 and verse 7. In verse 1 we read, 'the freedom wherewith Christ hath made us free' (*τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσεν*), with which we may compare John viii. 36: 'If therefore the Son hath made you free, ye shall be free indeed' (*ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθέρωσεν, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε*): in verse 7 we read 'Who did hinder you that you should not obey the truth?' (*τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψεν ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι;*), with which we may compare John viii. 31: 'If ye abide in my word . . . ye shall know the truth' (*ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ . . . γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν*).

In 2 Cor. iv. 3 we have another passage which Ewald thinks may be fairly claimed as indicating a knowledge on Paul's part of this same conversation in John viii. Paul is there speaking of the manner in which 'the god of this world hath blinded the minds of those that believe not' (*ἄπιστοι*). Here Ewald traces a connection with the words of John viii. 43–45, where Jesus tells the unbelieving Jews (*οὐ πιστεύετέ μοι*) that they do not understand His speech, because they cannot hear His word: 'ye are of your father the devil' (*ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ*). So, too, Ewald would compare Paul's conception (in 2 Cor. iv. 4) of Christ as 'the image of God' with the words which Jesus spoke of Himself in John viii. 19, 42, and Paul's reference in the same verse (2 Cor. iv. 4) to 'the god of this world' (*ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*) with the Johannine expression 'the prince of this world' (*ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου*)[1] (John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11, comp. also Ephes. ii. 2): these passages in the fourth Gospel are more fitted to explain Paul's expression than the supposition that it is derived from the later Rabbinic notion of 'the other God' and the like. Ewald concludes his parallel in ch. viii. by comparing the words of Jesus in verse 51: 'If any man keep my saying, he shall never see death' (*ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐμὸν τηρήσῃ, θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*) with Paul's conception of Christ in 2 Tim. i. 10, 'who hath destroyed

[1] Comp. Westcott, *Gospel of St. John*, *in loco*.

death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel' (*καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον, φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*).

In his examination of John x. Ewald commences by drawing attention to the parallels which Holtzmann cites ('Introduction,' p. 452) and from which he endeavours to prove that the writer of the fourth Gospel was dependent upon Paul: thus he compares John x. 14, 15, 27 with Gal. iv. 9; 1 Cor. viii. 2, 3, xiii. 12.[1] These parallels, in Ewald's judgment, are worthy of consideration, but for an opposite reason to that maintained by Holtzmann: they are proofs of the dependence of Paul upon the words of the Lord contained in the Johannean tradition.[2]

But Ewald proceeds to discuss a further significant word in this same chapter (x. 16), 'and other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring . . . and there shall be one flock and one shepherd' (*καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης· κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με ἀγαγεῖν . . . καὶ γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, εἷς ποιμήν*). Here, also, Holtzmann has not failed to notice the parallel presented by Ephes. ii. 13–15, 'But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh . . . he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition . . . to make in himself of twain one new man' (*νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτε ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγενήθητε ἐγγὺς . . . αὐτὸς ἡ εἰρήνη*

[1] Holtzmann (*Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 452, 453) compares also John i. 12—Gal. iii. 26. John i. 17—Rom. vi. 14. John iv. 36–38—1 Cor. iii. 6, viii. 14. John v. 25, 28—1 Cor. xv. 22. John vi. 51—1 Cor. x. 3, 4. John vi. 63—2 Cor. iii. 6. John vii. 19—Rom. ii. 17–19. John viii. 34–44—Rom. iv. 11; 1 Cor. viii. 2, 3, xiii. 12. John xii. 24—1 Cor. xv. 36, 37. John xiv. 9—2 Cor. iv. 4, 6.

[2] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 89 and note. In the note Ewald points out that as the verses 14, 15, 27, in John x., upon which Holtzmann depends, evidently refer back to the earlier verses 3, 4, we must therefore suppose that the whole chapter, and the whole allegory of the Shepherd and the sheep, is built upon the Pauline passages which Holtzmann quotes: this, as he continues, becomes additionally improbable when we remember that 1 Peter (pp. 70-72) affords a guarantee that the words of Jesus respecting the relationship between the Good Shepherd and his sheep are historical. Must we suppose, then, asks Ewald, that we have only the Evangelist's use of the word *γινώσκειν* to point us to Paul? Even if we had not such passages as Numb. xvi. 25 (comp. 2 Tim. ii. 19), this would be an improbable assertion.

ἡμῶν, ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἀμφότερα ἕν, καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας . . . ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον κ.τ.λ.).[1] But here again, as Ewald argues, Holtzmann's recognition of the parallel may be turned into an additional proof for the dependence of Paul upon the Johannean tradition. The decision as to the side on which the dependence lies is to be found, Ewald thinks, in the much-discussed expression καὶ τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας: here, and here only, the Apostle passes from the imagery of the commonwealth to that of the enclosed flock 'having broken down the hedge or fence (μεσότοιχον)' which confined the flock. It must, however, be remembered that here Ewald is evidently following Luther's version, and it is doubtful how far the word μεσότοιχον can bear the meaning attached to it and justify Ewald's reference of it to the imagery used in John x.

A third parallel Ewald derives from x. 17, with which he compares Phil. ii. 5 ff. But it will probably appear to many minds that his exegesis is somewhat forced and fanciful. According to him, the word of Jesus, 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life that I may take it again,' is exactly the same thought which is presented to us by Paul in Phil. ii. 5. In John x. 16 the thought is that the Father loves Him because He did not retain His life with care and anxiety, but readily surrendered it that He might take it again: in Phil. ii. 5 the thought is that Christ Jesus did not think that His equality with God consisted in grasping it—*i.e.* He did not believe that He must retain it anxiously, but He emptied Himself, and became obedient unto death, wherefore also God hath exalted Him. This parallel Ewald supports by comparing the expression 'obedient' (ὑπήκοος) in Phil. ii. 8 with the expression 'this commandment I have received' (ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον) in John x. 18, and the 'wherefore' (διὸ) of Phil. ii. 9 with the 'therefore' (διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτι) of John x. 17; so, too, the exaltation in Phil. ii. 9 which follows upon the voluntary

[1] Comp. also Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 198.

surrender of Jesus corresponds to the love of the Father which is the result of His self-surrender in John x. 17.

In Ewald's judgment all this similarity and sequence of thought proves that Paul was acquainted with the words of Jesus in John x. 17, 18. But it must be remembered that Ewald himself admits that Paul has transferred the words from the simple, almost enigmatical, form, in which he probably received them, into the more speculative form of his Christological teaching.

Of ch. xii. verses 35 ff. Ewald believes that we have reminiscences in 1 Thess. v. 5 and also in Ephes. v. 8. In both these passages we have the express contrast of 'light' and 'darkness' (*φῶς* and *σκότος*) just as we also find it in John iii. 19, whilst in Luke xvi. 8 we see *υἱοὶ τοῦ φωτός* placed in juxtaposition to *υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*.

In considering these parallels Ewald points out in a lengthy note[1] that Holtzmann also introduces them as strong evidence in support of his view of the dependence of the writer of the fourth Gospel upon the Pauline Epistles. He compares John xii. 35, iii. 20, 21 with Ephes. v. 8, 11, 13. As the parallels are very striking in expression, and besides, as the verses in Ephesians, which are there placed in the same context, occur in two separate places in the Gospel, it is evident, thinks Holtzmann, that the dependence lies on the side of the latter. But why, Ewald asks, should it be thought improbable that Paul, on his part, should combine a traditional word of the Lord which invites men to walk as children of light with another which speaks of evil as avoiding or deserving the reproof which the light brings with it? Surely nothing would be more natural (comp. esp. John iii. 20 and Ephes. v. 13).

With regard to the chapters which follow, Ewald points out that our Lord's last discourses, which these chapters contain, probably were not so well suited for connected tradition, because they contain no points upon which the memory could fasten: all the more valuable, therefore, is it if we can find in Paul (as in Peter) thoughts and expressions

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 91.

akin to them. Thus, with John xv. 12 we may compare Ephes. v. 2 (also Gal. ii. 20). Passing to ch. xvi., verse 11 may be compared with 1 Cor. ii. 10. In this parallel, not only does Paul's assertion of the revealing activity of the divine Spirit form a point of contact with Jesus' promise of the instructing and guiding activity of the Paraclete, but the reason given by the Apostle corresponds exactly with the interpretation of the work of the Spirit given by Jesus (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 10 with John xvi. 13–15): and just as Jesus tells His disciples that after they have received the Spirit they shall be guided by It into all truth (comp. verse 23), so Paul dares boldly to assert of 'the spiritual man' that 'he judgeth all things' (1 Cor. ii. 15). Ewald also finds two other parallels between this same chapter in the fourth Gospel and the opening chapters of 1 Corinthians. In ch. iii. 1 Paul writes: 'And I *was not able* to speak unto you as unto spiritual, &c. I have fed you with milk and not with meat: *for not yet were ye able*' (*κἀγὼ οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς κ.τ.λ. γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὔπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε*): in John xvi. 12 Jesus says: *ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι.* So, too, in 1 Cor. ii. 12 Paul writes: 'For the natural man *cannot receive* the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, and he *cannot know* them (*ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ· μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστιν καὶ οὐ δύναται γνῶναι*): in John xiv. 17 Jesus says: 'the Spirit of truth, which the world *cannot receive*, for it seeth it not, neither *knoweth* it' (*τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει αὐτό*). In addition to such parallels, Ewald points to the fact that in the same chapters we have a whole series of expressions corresponding with thoughts familiar to us in Paul: *e.g.* Jesus the way to the Father; the condition of Christians as 'a being in Christ;' of Christ in us; the blessed future 'a being with the Lord,' and so on. Possibly such parallels as these may appeal to many minds more powerfully than those in which Ewald seems to lay too much stress upon verbal correspondences.

In commencing his examination of ch. xvii. Ewald remarks that here, too, we might expect that the same strictures would apply as to ch. xiv.–xvi., and that if we should be content to follow many theologians who are glad to regard this chapter, like chapter v., as full of a 'subjective' colouring, we could scarcely hope to gain any satisfaction whatever from its consideration. But he reminds us that the Epistles of James and 1 Peter have furnished us with a very different result, a result which, he proceeds to show, is corroborated by the Epistles of Paul. Moreover, it is after all conceivable—if there is any historical account—that the disciples would have taken pains at an early date to recall to memory the course of this last great prayer of Jesus, and to fix the words of it to a certain extent.

We commence with what Ewald regards as a plain parallel between 1 Thess. i. 9 and John xvii. 3. In the latter passage we read that 'this is life eternal, to know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent' (*ἵνα γινώσκουσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*). In the former passage Paul reminds the Thessalonians, how they had turned to God from idols 'to serve the living and true God and to wait for his Son from heaven' (*δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν*). The parallel, in Ewald's opinion, is the more worthy of consideration because it is evident that in Paul the first infinitive, *δουλεύειν κ.τ.λ.*, is really superfluous after the preceding *ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεόν*: it therefore becomes evident that the Apostle was acquainted with the new state of the Christian set forth in the two clauses of John xvii. 3. A second proof in favour of his view Ewald derives from a number of general references to this chapter in Paul's description of the position of Christians. For him Christians are 'sanctified' (*ἡγιασμένοι*, 1 Cor. i. 2; comp. also Acts 20, 32, xxvi. 18; Ephes. v. 26), an expression which corresponds with the words of Christ in His last prayer for His disciples, John xvii. 17, 19; so, too, they are all to come 'unto a unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man' (*εἰς*

ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ), Ephes. iv. 13, expressions which correspond with the will of Jesus declared in John xvii. verses 21 and 23, 'that they all may be one . . . that they may be made perfect in one' (ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν . . . ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν). The final aim, moreover, of the Christian is 'to be with the Lord' (1 Thess. iv. 17; Phil. i. 23), with which the concluding petition of the prayer corresponds, 'Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me *where I am*' (verse 24): thus everywhere we trace the thoughts of the high-priestly prayer.

But Ewald has by no means completed his proofs, and he proceeds to discuss another passage, the introduction to 1 Corinthians, in which he finds what he regards as an echo of the whole prayer. The description of Christians as 'those that are sanctified' (1 Cor. i. 2) has already afforded us a parallel with John xvii. 17, 19. In verse 4 Paul commences with thanks for the grace of God which had been given (τῇ δοθείσῃ) to the Corinthians in Christ Jesus, in that they were enriched in Him in all utterance and in all knowledge (ἐν παντὶ λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει). Unconsciously we turn back to John xvii. 2 ff. There also we find a gift on the part of Christ (ἵνα δώσῃ αὐτοῖς, verse 2), and a knowledge (γινώσκειν) is there also the contents of the gift (verse 3). This knowledge is attained through a communication of the word of God (λόγος), of the words (ῥήματα) which the Father had given to the Son to communicate to men, and it extends to all that the Father had given to the Son (comp. πάντα ὅσα with Paul's ἐν πάντι λόγῳ: and the whole passage John xvii. 6–12 with 1 Cor. i. 2): the parallel, to Ewald's mind, is evident. But it can be carried, so he thinks, further still. Paul declares his confidence that God will confirm the Corinthian Christians unto the end (ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς, verse 8); it is the same advance in thought which we trace in John xvii. Jesus had given to His own what the Father had committed unto Him: now He prays that the Father may keep them in His name (verse 12), τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου: and again, 'that Thou shouldest keep them from

the evil (verse 15), *ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ*. Further: 'God is faithful,' says Paul in conclusion, 'through whom ye were called unto the fellowship of his Son (*εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*). What else is this, asks Ewald, but an echo of those words of Jesus contained in verses 6, 10, 14, 16, 23, 24, of this same chapter of the fourth Gospel? But the parallel can be extended another step: with this thanks to God and this expression of hope, Paul introduces an exhortation to intellectual and spiritual unity: is it too much to suppose that it was exactly this purpose which caused the Apostle to join himself consciously or unconsciously in that prayer of Christ, in which the petition 'that they may be one' (*ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν*, verses 11, 22, 23) played so important a part?

These parallels, which he concludes with ch. xvii., are, in Ewald's judgment, sufficient for his purpose: in conjunction with Paul's independence of word and thought we can still plainly recognise that Johannean material was widely known to him, and that it exercised a significant influence upon him.

It must of course be remembered that Ewald's argument is much strengthened by his appeal to parallels in James and 1 Peter with the Johannean tradition.[1] But it is enough for our present purpose to bear in mind that Ewald is so confident of his position with regard to the three Apostles (James, Peter, Paul) and their acquaintance with the Johannean tradition, that he believes that position to be quite safe, even if a whole series of deductions were made from the passages which he has adduced to support it. If it is once established that the fourth Gospel has claim to extensive credit on *several* occasions where it offers us independent material—we may take, *e.g.*, such passages as iii. 1 ff., viii. 31 ff., x. 1 ff., xvii. 1 ff., which also vouch to some extent for the course of the external history—then Ewald insists that opposing critics will be compelled to moderate their position with regard to the remaining passages, and, indeed, to abandon it entirely. It is the mouth of three witnesses which testifies

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, pp. 59–68 for St. James; pp. 68–75 for St. Peter.

against them, and their testimonies agree; they work into one another; they mutually support and strengthen each other: Ewald expresses his firm conviction that no unprejudiced inquirer will even attempt to make any considerable deductions in face of such unanimous testimony: he is, on the contrary, much more inclined to believe that many proofs which he has placed on one side would be readily accepted after it has been once made clear that a common 'Johannean' historical groundwork must have been present.[1]

Thus far we have endeavoured to connect the Epistles with our Lord's life and teaching; and when we consider the nature of the documents in question—that they are letters, written to men whose acquaintance with the main facts of the Gospel story is evidently presupposed—the wonder is, not that the allusions to the human life and teaching of Jesus are so few, but that they are so many.[2] How much, *e.g.*, is involved in the statement *Jesus is the Christ*, which Schwegler describes as the source and substance of the Apostolic message! If, moreover, we admit that there are scarcely any direct references to the recorded sayings of Jesus in the Pauline Epistles,[3] yet we cannot too often remind ourselves

[1] *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 97.

[2] 'In spite of the character which was necessitated by their destination, the Epistles contain in scattered notices a fairly complete sketch of the life of Christ, such as might be gathered from the letters of a missionary of the present day thoroughly familiar with the substance of the Gospels' (Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 178). See also C. Uhlhorn, *ubi supra*, p. 113 ff.

[3] 'Though it be true that scarcely any clear references to the recorded discourses of the Lord are contained in the Epistles (for the reference of 1 Cor. vii. 10 to Matt. v. 32, and of 1 Cor. ix. 14 to Luke x. 4, 7, cf. 1 Tim. v. 18, is at best uncertain), it is no less true that the life and words of Christ are everywhere assumed as the basis of all doctrine. . . . It is everywhere assumed that the Christian is familiar with the portraiture of his Master, and each of the traits which are preserved in these passing notices is seen in its full expression in the Gospels' (*ibid.* pp. 182, 183). Comp. the remarks of Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 22, where he maintains that we cannot argue that Paul did not know the discourses of Jesus because he seldom expressly refers to them, since this is also the case in the epistles of eyewitnesses, a Peter and a James. After pointing out that in 1 Cor. ix. 14, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Cor. vii. 10, Paul appeals to words and comments of Christ without expressly quoting them, he expresses his conviction that both Paul and the other Apostles were far more fully acquainted with the teaching of Jesus than has hitherto been recognised. See also p. 307 ff. above.

that as these references are introduced to meet some practical difficulty, or to answer some question of Church discipline, we are justified in inferring, not that Paul's information was deficient or exhausted, but rather that he had at his command a rich store of knowledge from which he could draw as occasion demanded, even if we cannot fully endorse the conclusion that the Apostle's memory was 'saturated, as it were, with the acts and the words of the life of Jesus.'[1]

[1] Dean Plumptre in Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.* (Cassell) vol. i. Introd. p. 31.

CHAPTER VI

OUR LORD'S DEATH AND BURIAL

It has been said of the Gospels that however condensed their earlier portions may be, they expand into the minute particularity of a diary as they approach the foot of the Cross. The Epistles are writings of a very different nature, and we cannot expect to apply such a description to them, but they are, at all events, in perfect harmony with the Gospels in the prominence which they assign to the closing scenes of the life of Jesus. So graphically did St. Paul paint Jesus Christ as the Crucified One before the eyes of the Galatians, and assuredly also of the Corinthians, that they could see all the incidents of the drama of the Cross as clearly as if they had been enacted in their presence (Gal. iii. 1).[1] And in this, as the same writer reminds us, there is nothing peculiar to St. Paul. As far as we can trace it, the attitude of the other Apostles was exactly the same. The author of the Apocalypse, whose spirit was so intent upon the future revelation of Christ, lived entirely in the contemplation of His death, so far as he dwelt at all upon the earthly sojourn of Jesus.[2] The Gospels, even those which no one has ever

[1] On the force of the word προεγράφη, see Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 13; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 58; Lipsius, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 30, 1891.

Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 270; Plumptre, *Christ and Christendom*, new edit. 1886, p. 38 and note.

See, however, Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 177, 181; and Lightfoot, *Galatians*, *in loco*, p. 134.

Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 290, denies that any inference can be drawn from Gal. iii. 1 as to Paul's acquaintance with the details of the Passion, but at the same time he admits the Apostle's knowledge of the leading facts (see notes below).

[2] Paret, *ibid.* Comp. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 72 note.

maintained to have been composed under preponderating Pauline influences—viz. those of Matthew and Mark—present only a slight sketch, a mere outline, a pencil-like drawing of the life of Jesus ; but the nearer they approach the history of the Passion, the more do they narrate their story in detail. Whilst, as Paret observes, they pass over almost in silence the whole course of years which preceded the public ministry of Jesus, and whilst they often only group together in a cursory manner the events of His public teaching, we are bidden under their guidance—as the Galatians at the bidding of Paul—to accompany Jesus step by step during His few last days of suffering,[1] as if they also wished 'to know nothing else but Jesus and Him Crucified' (1 Cor. ii. 2).

In this connection Paret reminds us that the particular details of the history of the Passion which, as occasion arises, find mention in the Epistles of Paul, are quite in accordance with the notices of the Gospels. Thus, the accusation and condemnation of Jesus proceed primarily, not from the mass of the common people, but from the rulers of this world (1 Cor. ii. 8 and Matt. xxvi. 3 ; comp. 1 Thess. ii. 14) :[2] treachery also was at work by means of which He fell into the hands of His enemies, and this treachery was

[1] Paret, *ibid.* ; see also Holtzmann, 'Die Synoptiker,' in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 17, 1889, and see above, p. 72, for Renan on the Passion.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 13 ; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 19 ; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70 ; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 66 ; Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 58 (Paret compares the expression used by Josephus, *Arch.* xiii. 3, 3, ἐνδείξει τῶν πρώτων ἀνδρῶν παρ' ἡμῖν) ; Keim, *ubi supra*, i. 41 ; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 289, 5. Aufl. ; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 69 ; Wittichen, *Leben Jesu*, p. 15. On the historical character of the narrative of the betrayal, see Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 504, 505, and Fairbairn, *ubi supra*, p. 254.

In 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, the persecution and violent death of the Lord Jesus are here placed between two similar events, the persecution of the Jewish prophets and the actual sufferings of the Christian Apostles, as equally historical and equally notorious ; and in the same connection we naturally recall the expression which occurs quite incidentally in 1 Cor. ii. 8. Birks, *Horæ Apostolicæ*, p. 356. Comp., too, Dean Howson upon the significance of Paul's expression in 1 Cor. ii. 8 (*Evidential Conclusions from the Four Greater Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 8).

If we are justified in ascribing 1 Timothy to St. Paul, we have an expression in ch. vi. 13, in the solemn charge to Timothy, which is very closely connected—more closely, indeed, than at first sight appears—with the Article of the Creed, 'Suffered under Pontius Pilate.' 'I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who *before Pontius Pilate* wit-

carried out upon an appointed night (1 Cor. xi. 23, and Matt. xxvi. 31):[1] moreover, the comparison which the Apostle draws between Christ's death and the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb seems to indicate a knowledge of the exact time of the year at which the Saviour suffered.[2]

But the earlier hours of this night of betrayal were marked by a solemn scene, the Institution of the Lord's Supper, with the details of which St. Paul claims to have been intimately acquainted. At the commencement of his recital the Apostle speaks of '*the Lord Jesus*, in the night in which He was betrayed' (1 Cor. xi. 23), a title sufficiently startling, when we remember its significance to the Jewish mind (see above, chapter iv.) and that it is here attributed, as

nessed a good confession' (see Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 163, 6. Aufl.). Here we have not only a direct reference to our Lord's trial, but there is also high authority for taking the word ἐπί as simply marking the date, just like the word 'under' in the Creed. This is the view of Dr. Westcott, but it is of interest to notice his remark that if we adopt the common translation, the reference in that case must be rather to St. John's Gospel, ch. xviii. 36, than to St. Matthew's, ch. xxvii. 11 (*Study of the Gospels*, p. 180).

So, too, Dean Stanley in commenting upon the same passage, adds that it is the more remarkable because, although it may be sufficiently explained by the answer in St. Matthew, yet it points much more naturally to the long and solemn interview peculiar to St. John. For a similar view see also Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, p. 275.

Comp. also Thenius, *ubi supra*, pp. 55, 69, and the recent work of P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, pp. 77, 78, 151.

[1] In addition to the authorities cited at the commencement of the previous note, it may be sufficient to refer to Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 16, 17; Reuss, *ubi supra*, p. 163, and the summary of the views of the various writers mentioned in chap. ii.

Comp. also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 504, 505, note; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 243.

[2] Weiss, who denies that any inference can be drawn from Gal. iii. 1 as to Paul's acquaintance with the details of the Passion, yet admits the force of 1 Cor. ii. 8 and 1 Cor. v. 7, as showing the Apostle's knowledge of the instruments and the season of the Saviour's death: 'Er wusste dass Jesus am Passahfeste (1 Cor. v. 7) von den jüdischen und heidnischen Machthabern (1 Cor. ii. 8) ans Kreuz geschlagen war; aber dass er den Tod Christi mit allen Details seinen Gemeinden erzählt hatte, lässt sich keineswegs aus Gal. iii. 1 schliessen' (*B. T.* 5. Aufl. pp. 289, 290).

Comp. on 1 Cor. v. 7 as a note of time, Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 14; Thenius, *ubi supra*, p. 69; Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 58; Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 20; comp. also Meyer's note, *in loco*; Birks, *Horæ Apostolicæ*, p. 360; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 180.

a title already accepted and well known, to 'an outcast of the people' who, some five-and-twenty years previously, had been put to death upon a cross of shame. But such a title is in reality the best justification of the words and deeds which follow in Paul's recital, a recital in which we enter into the presence and listen to the voice of a more than human teacher.

It is easy no doubt to point to the verbal differences between St. Paul's account and that of the first three Gospels. But the agreement which exists between St. Paul and St. Luke is confessedly so close that the differences in detail are of no significance in comparison with it.[1] And if we are asked to believe that the earliest form of the words actually spoken by Jesus is to be found in St. Mark,[2] it does not appear that the Evangelist himself was aware of any serious discrepancy between his own and the Pauline narrative. For we must remember that St. Mark, no less than St. Luke, was during part of his career a companion of St. Paul: he was associated with him in his early missionary life, and later on he had laboured with him in Rome; is it reasonable to suppose that he was unacquainted with whatever words of Institution St. Paul adopted at the celebration of the Lord's Supper?[3] And yet Mark's account of the words spoken in

[1] See the emphatic remarks of Renan, *Les Évangiles*, pp. 269, 270, 284; comp. also Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, pp. 237, 238, and 395, 396; and Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 77.

[2] For Steck's preference for the Matthew-Mark account, which he regards as earlier than that of the Lucan-Pauline, and Gloël's criticism of Steck's view, see chap. iii. 196–200 (see also for Resch's distinction between the two accounts, and his conclusions from it, chap. ii. p. 120). Comp., however, Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 343, 344, and also *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 518 (chap. ii. p. 102); also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 513, 514, note, where he points out that we are dependent upon Mark's account or Paul's, since he holds that Luke combines these two, while the first Evangelist simply repeats Mark's description. At the same time it will be noticed that Weiss believes that Paul's account is older than Mark's, and he terms it 'the really official one,' for Paul would not have introduced this usage into his Churches without assuring himself of its historical foundation. Comp. Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers*, pp. 112, 113, 1891, for the view that the original words of Institution may be traced back to Paul and Mark.

[3] The readers of Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the N. T.* will remember that he speaks of the close resemblance between the words of Institution in 1 Cor.

the upper chamber was written within a few years of Paul's death—if we may not say, in his lifetime. If, moreover, as Schenkel affirms, Mark's account was derived from Peter,[1] it would appear that both Peter and Paul must have been in substantial and recognised agreement, so that of the Lord's Supper, as of other facts, Paul might well exclaim with reference to the first disciples, 'Whether it was I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed' (1 Cor. xv. 11).[2]

But there is one most important word which we are justified in retaining in all four accounts, the word which the Revisers carefully translate 'covenant' (*διαθήκη*), although it will no doubt be said that in St. Matthew and St. Mark we have no right to read 'the *new* covenant,' but simply 'the covenant.'[3] It will be noticed, however, that Weizsäcker in quoting the four accounts of the words of Institution, whilst he divides them into what he calls two families, Matthew and Mark forming one, and Luke and Paul the other, fails to see any opposition between them, but rather a proof of the freedom which characterised Apostolic explanations of the ordinance: and if, as in his judgment, the formula of Mark was certainly derived from the primitive Church, he can see no reason why Paul's version should not be referred to a similar source.[4]

But let us allow that the word 'new' (*καινή*) was originally wanting in Matthew and Mark: even then we still have a declaration of the mighty importance which Jesus attached to His own death. Keim acknowledged this in more than

and in Luke's Gospel as the strongest token that has been found of indebtedness on Luke's part to Pauline Epistles: 'I am myself inclined,' he adds, 'to explain that resemblance by the liturgical use of the words. Luke would probably have often heard Paul, when conducting divine service, recite the words of Institution, and so they would come into his Gospel in the same form' (p. 320). The same theory with regard to the liturgical use of the words is adopted by Godet, *Commentaire sur l'Évangile de St. Luc*, p. 29.

[1] So also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 513; the same view would be quite in harmony with what is now called 'the two document' hypothesis; comp. *e.g.* Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, pp. 37–44, 172, 173, 205.

[2] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 15.

[3] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 275, 276, see also his article, 'Das Nachtmahl im Sinne des Stifters,' in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, p. 83, 1859.

[4] *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 597. Comp. Renan, *Les Évangiles*, p. 78.

one remarkable passage. Paul, he thinks, no doubt interpreted the death of Jesus from the circumstances of his own time, but this interpretation did not contradict the facts of the Saviour's earthly life: there must have been something in the historical Jesus more comprehensive than Judaism and its law, which justified Paul in seeing in His death a purpose which transcended all national limitations, and in going so far as to speak of a 'new covenant'—an expression which he quotes from the mouth of Jesus; a 'new covenant' which Jesus expressly declared to be founded upon His death, after the pattern of the old; and of the design of Jesus to deliver men by that death from the law, and to reconcile not only the Jews, but even the heathen world also to God.[1] So too, in a later part of his work, in describing the details of the scene of the Last Supper, Keim again insists upon the fact that even if Jesus did not use the word 'new,' and its introduction is to be ascribed to Paul, yet He truly perfected the *new*, the real, the true covenant, which crowned the beginnings, the prophecies, the prototypes of Mosaic times, without threatening thereby the validity and the truth of the Law and the Prophets.[2]

But Strauss, no less than Keim, acknowledges the significance of the terms in which Jesus spoke of His own death as He instituted the Last Supper. Strauss thinks that the scene depicted by the first three Evangelists is quite conceivable owing to the forebodings which naturally pressed upon Jesus as He recognised His real position, and saw Himself surrounded, on the one side, by fanatic and desperate enemies who were capable of daring the utmost, and, on the other, by intimate friends who only imperfectly understood Him.

When then, as master of the household, Jesus broke the bread for distribution, and poured out the red wine,

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 40. Comp. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. pp. 59, 60 *note*, where he admits that however difficult it may be to explain precisely the words of Jesus in delivering the bread and the wine to the disciples at the Last Supper, yet one thing is certain, that He connected the forgiveness of sins with His death (comp. p. 55).

[2] Keim, *ibid.* iii. 276.

Strauss thinks that there may have been involuntarily present to His mind the thought of His body destined perchance for a similar fate at the hands of His cruel foes, and the thought of His blood, which perchance would shortly be poured forth, and that full of forebodings He may have assured His disciples that such would be His fate. Thus absorbed in the thought of His near death, He may have regarded it as having a sacrificial aspect, *and His blood as the consecration of a new covenant between God and man.*[1]

But our Lord was speaking to Jews: that is, to men who knew all that the word 'covenant' involved, who must have been reminded, as they heard it, of the most solemn fact in their own national history, and in their own individual lives; to Jews: that is, to men who would naturally shrink even from the symbolical drinking of blood in face of the stern and repeated enactments of their own Law. And yet he virtually claims to supersede that old Mosaic Covenant, and to ratify a new one by His own blood (see Keim's note, 'Geschichte Jesu,' Bd. i. p. 40, where he admits that Matt. xxvi. 28 is essentially the same as 1 Cor. xi. 25[2]), the shedding of which was to ensure forgiveness of sins, a prerogative which, as every Jew was eager to maintain, belonged to God, and to God alone! But, from this point of view, such a claim must have had the same significance to Paul as to the Twelve; to him also pertained the Covenant and the giving of the Law, but to him, no less than to them, it was a matter of historical fact that Jesus of Nazareth, on the night in which He was betrayed, had spoken of His death in a manner which implied an intolerable arrogance or a divine claim, for what man could redeem his brother, or make agreement unto God for him to him, no less than to every member of the Church

[1] Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. 358; comp. Luthardt, 'Die modernen Darstellungen des Lebens Jesu' (*Gesammelte Vorträge*, p. 100), and Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 393, 394, for a criticism of this passage in Strauss. See also Dr. Salmon's *Reign of Law, and other Sermons*, pp. 37–53, to which attention is drawn by Dr. Maclear in his Preface to *The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*.

[2] 'Neuer Bund 1 Cor. xi. 25, im Wesentlichen auch Mt. xxvi. 28.'

of Christ, the bread broken and the wine outpoured had become the Supper of *the Lord*.[1]

But are there any indications that St. Paul was able in thought to follow our Lord, as He passed out into the night across the brook Kedron to the Garden of Gethsemane? When we remember how plainly Holtzmann declares that the way in which Paul introduces his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper presupposes a narrative in detail of the last hours of Jesus,[2] it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the Apostle must have been acquainted with the scene in Gethsemane. But it cannot be said that we have any direct reference in the writings of St. Paul to the Agony in the Garden,[3] although the passage which is so often associated with this part of the Passion occurs in an Epistle which we are justified in referring to the Apostle's school, and to the Apostolic age.[4] In the passage in question (Heb. v. 7),

[1] On the significance of the Institution of the Lord's Supper, and its influence upon the early Christian Church, see the remarkable passage in Wendt, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, pp. 594, 595, 1890, where he speaks of the action of Jesus in thus founding this rite as a masterpiece of wisdom, especially in relation to the men with whom, as His disciples, he had to deal; and comp. the important remarks of Beyschlag (see chap. ii. p. 99) in connection with the bearing of the words of Institution upon the sinless consciousness of Jesus.

It will be noticed that the reference of the words and acts of Jesus to such passages as Exodus xxiv. 8 is not only found in Christian Apologetic writers in England (comp. *e.g.* Maclear's *Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*; Matheson's 'Historical Christ,' in *Expositor*, i. [2nd series], 431–443), but also in Wendt, *ubi supra*, pp. 584, 586; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* pp. 216, 217; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 516, 517; Strauss, *ubi supra*; Holtzmann, 'Die Synoptiker' (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*), p. 278. On the historical character of the Lord's Supper, see Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 513; and for further remarks on the sources of St. Paul's information, see below, chap. ix. Dean Plumptre has some valuable comments upon the tendency to lose sight of the *evidential value* of the Eucharist (Ellicott's *Commentary*, i. 163).

[2] 'Die Synoptiker' (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*), p. 17, 1889.

[3] This is, however, maintained by Dr. Matheson with regard to 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9, in his *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 79, 188. So, too, Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus und die Reden des Herrn Jesu*, p. 66.

[4] De Wette assigned the Epistle to a time shortly before the outbreak of the Roman-Jewish War, 65–67 A.D. *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des N. T.* p. 357, 6. Aufl. 1880; Ewald, to the same period, *Das Sendschreiben an die Hebräer*, pp. 3, 5, 1870; Hilgenfeld, to 64–66 A.D., *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 388, 1875; Beyschlag, to a date preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 A.D., *Leben Jesu*, i. 64, 1887; Renan regards 66 A.D. as the probable date, *Saint Paul*, Introd. p. 61, 1888, 12th edit. (comp. *L'Antechrist*, Introd. p. 13,

'Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death,' even Strauss could find a reminiscence of the scene in Gethsemane.[1] And if Keim is right in supposing that this passage is more naturally referred to the strong cry upon the cross[2] (Matt. xxvii. 46, 50; Luke xxiii. 46), we may at least conclude that the writer of the Epistle was acquainted with the details of the Crucifixion. But is there any reason why the words should not contain a twofold reference: (1) to the Agony; (2) to the loud cry upon the Cross?[3]

In this connection we naturally recall another passage of the same Epistle, Heb. xiii. 12, 13: 'Jesus . . . suffered without the gate; let us go forth therefore unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach'—words which suggest a reference to Jesus led forth to die outside the city, and to Simon of Cyrene compelled to bear the Cross.[4] No doubt

1873, 3rd edit.); B. Weiss considers that it was probably written during the threatening symptoms of the breaking out of the Jewish War, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 345, 347, 1889, 2. Aufl.; Salmon places it at 66, or 67 at the latest, *Introd. to N. T.* p. 431, 5th edit.; and Westcott, between 64–67 (*Epistle to the Hebrews*, p. xlii. [Introd.]).

Bleek assigned 68–69 as the probable date, and in the fourth edition of his *Einleitung in das N. T.*, revised by Mangold, a review of the dates maintained by various critics is given in a lengthy note, pp. 690, 691 (4. Aufl. 1886). Mangold rejects the date 116–118 A.D. to which Volkmar (together with Keim and Hausrath) referred the Epistle, as too late, but he regards Holtzmann's view, which plac s it at the end of the first century on the ground of supposed traces of Domitian's persecution (cf. also von Soden, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* iii. 14, zweite Abtheilung, 1890) as lying within the sphere of possibility (but see Weiss, *ubi supra*, p. 345); beyond this period he thinks we cannot proceed.

For the manner in which it may be said that this Epistle touches on each of the great features in our Lord's life, see Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 181 (comp. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 65, but see also, on the other hand, the remarks of von Soden, *ubi supra*, p. 3).

[1] Comp. also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 536, note; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 65; Steinmeyer, *Die Geschichte der Passion des Herrn*, p. 41, 2. Aufl. 1882; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, p. 181; and see references to Keim in note 2, for the passage in Strauss.

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 306, note, 427, 429.

[3] *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* (Strack and Zöckler) *zum N. T.*, vierte Abtheilung, p. 170.

[4] Comp. Steinmeyer and Beyschlag, *ubi supra*, and Keim, *ubi supra*, p. 400; von Soden admits the allusion to the place of execution in xiii. 12 and to the death-

the attempt to establish a connection between the latter incident and Rom. xvi. 13, where reference is made to a certain Rufus as a well-known member of the Christian Church at Rome (comp. Mark xv. 21, where Simon is described as the father of Alexander and Rufus)[1] may seem to many minds somewhat vague and fanciful, but it is most important to remember that Volkmar emphasises the connection between the two passages, and thinks it quite possible that Mark whilst with Paul at Rome had become acquainted with Rufus; hence the mention in the Gospel which bears the name of Mark, not only of Simon, but also of his two sons.

But if, in accordance with Volkmar's own admissions, Mark himself was probably the young man who fled naked from Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 51, 52), and if the details of the Crucifixion in the Gospel which bears the name of Mark were derived, as Volkmar also admits, from a witness dwelling in Jerusalem, and were published as early as 73 A.D.,[2] it is not unreasonable to suppose that the incidents in the last hours of the Saviour's life were previously widely known, and that Paul must have had easy access to such knowledge, a supposition materially strengthened if Mark was by his side in Rome.

As we pass to the next Article of the Creed, 'Was

struggle (not to Gethsemane) in v. 7, although he finds very little reference in *Hebrews* to the human life of Jesus (*Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* iii. 3, zweite Abtheilung, 1890.

[1] Godet, *Commentaire sur L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 596, 2nd edit. 1890; Plumptre (Ellicott's *Commentary*), i. 231; Bishop of Derry, *Leading Ideas of the Gospels*, p. 58; see, however, Lipsius in *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* Bd. ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 188, 1891. Comp. Carpenter, *First Three Gospels*, p. 287, on the connection between Mark xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13.

Professor Jowett, in *Epistles to the Thess.* &c. ii. 425, compares St. Paul's expression in ch. xvi. 13, '*and his mother and mine*,' with Christ's words upon the Cross, as He commended His mother to the care of St. John, '*Woman, behold thy son!*' . . . '*Behold thy mother!*' (John xix. 26, 27). It has recently been suggested that we have a sweet and solemn reminiscence of the last Word from the Cross, not only in 1 Pet. iv. 19 (as is so often admitted), but also in 2 Tim. i. 12, παραθήκην μου; comp. Luke xxiii. 46, and see Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.* iii. 222, on the meaning of the word παραθήκη (Bishop of Derry, *Verbum Crucis*, p. 106).

[2] *Jesus Nazarenus*, pp. 18, 19, 122, 135, 304.

crucified, dead, and buried,' we naturally associate with the words the opening verses of 1 Cor. xv., those verses in which St. Paul insists upon the historical facts of Christ's death for our sins, His burial, His resurrection, in what has been well termed 'the first Creed of Christendom.' The references which the Apostle makes to the death of Jesus are in entire harmony with the narratives of the Evangelists. The Passion of Jesus was the time of His weakness, His defencelessness, and powerlessness (2 Cor. xiii. 4): He suffered death upon a cross of wood (Gal. iii. 13), to which He was nailed (Col. ii. 14), and on which He shed His blood (Col. i. 20):[1] during the hours of His Passion He was exposed to revilings which He endured without a murmur (Rom. xv. 3):[2] if we look at it from the side of the Sufferer, this death upon the Cross was an act of obedience towards God (Phil. ii. 8; Rom. v. 19: comp. Matt. xxvi. 39 f.), and also the surrender of self in love to man (Gal. ii. 20; Matt. xx. 28), whose sins were thus taken away and atoned for (comp. the account of the Last Supper in St. Paul and the Synoptists): at the same time, all this was done that the Scriptures might be fulfilled (Matt. xxvi. 54, and 1 Cor. xv. 3), a point of view which is in entire agreement with the unanimous voice of the Evangelists.[3]

But if the Pauline Epistles only corroborated the two historical facts, which we can prove quite apart from any Christian documents, viz. the Crucifixion of Christ, and the rise of the Christian Church, we are apt to forget how much these two facts presuppose. That *a Jew* should have been the Founder of the Christian Church is a fact which arrests attention, if we bear in mind, on the one hand, the national

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 14; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 58; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 289; Hausrath, *ubi supra*, p. 70; P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 78, note; Ellicott's *Commentary on the N. T.* iii. 108.

[2] See Paret, Sabatier, Hausrath, as in previous note; comp. also Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 431.

Weiss, however, is of opinion that the fact that Paul illustrates this trait of Christ in Rom. xv. 3, by a reference to Psalm lxix. 10, shows how little he realised the details of the sufferings (*Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 290; but comp. Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 14.

[3] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 14.

pride and culture of the Roman and the Greek, and, on the other hand, the exclusive narrowness of Judaism. But *a Crucified Jew*![1] it is difficult for us to realise the extreme shame and degradation which attached even to the name of the cross in the heathen world, and no one has emphasised this more fully and graphically than Keim, whilst the detestation with which crucifixion was regarded by the Jews must have been intensified in the case of Jesus of Nazareth by the fact that the heathen Romans were the instruments of His punishment.[2]

That St. Paul, both a Roman citizen and a Hebrew of the Hebrews, was keenly alive to the depth of the humiliation which the cross involved is evident from the manner in which he speaks of the Saviour becoming obedient, so obedient as to die, *yea, to die the death of the cross* (Phil. ii. 8): and even if we could conceive the teaching of Jesus winning its way in individual cases among the Greeks, who sought after wisdom, and who were accustomed to associate the thought of a wise man like their own Socrates with the poison cup, how could the Jews accept a crucified fellow-countryman as their Messiah? To the Greeks Christ crucified was only foolishness; to the Jews He was a stumbling-block. There is no proof that at the time of Jesus' earthly life any general expectation prevailed of a *suffering* Messiah; and it is plain that even in the second century, when the Christian interpretation of prophecy may well have made some impression, the offence of the Cross had not ceased:[3] it was one

[1] Comp. Ullmann, *Was setzt die Stiftung der christlichen Kirche durch einen Gekreuzigten voraus?* pp. 13, 18, 21, 22, 26, 27, 30.

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 409 ff.; Ullmann, *ubi supra*, pp. 7, 8.

It is noteworthy that in this connection (p. 413) Keim not only speaks of the way in which the Christian teachers from the first to the last, with Paul at their head (1 Cor. i. 23), dwell upon the shame of the servile punishment of the cross, but he adds: '"If the Messiah can suffer," cries the Jew Trypho to Justin Martyr, "yet he cannot be crucified; he cannot die such a shameful, dishonourable death!"' (Justin, *Trypho*, 90 and 32). See also p. 605. Comp. Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 100.

[3] See chap. i. p. 23: the whole Appendix on the 'Suffering Messiah' in Schürer should be consulted, and esp. Dalman's *Der leidende und der sterbende Messias*. Dr. Dalman (p. 30) argues from passages in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles (1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. v. 11) that the suffering of the Messiah was evi-

thing to admit that the Scriptures pointed to a Christ liable to suffering, but quite another thing to admit that such suffering could find expression in the ignominy of a crucifixion, a death cursed by the Law.

But the same passage in the Roman historian Tacitus which witnesses to the fact of the Crucifixion, also bears witness to the fact that Judæa was the source from which the religion of the Christ proceeded.[1] And yet how could

dently regarded as something strange and repulsive to the Jewish people in the time of Jesus. For the *oldest* interpretations of Isaiah liii. see also Dalman, *ubi supra*, p. 27–35, where he maintains that the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah was not pre-Christian, but that the *possibility* of it which he admits was present (p. 34) was not realised in Rabbinical theology until a much later date (p. 21–23, 89, 91). Comp. esp. Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 122–125. We may add to these former references the emphatic statement of Wendt to the same effect, *Der Inhalt der Lehre Jesu*, p. 541, 1890: 'Wenn auch das spätere Judenthum sich mit der Vorstellung von dem leidenden Messias beschäftigt hat, so gilt doch nicht nur, dass diese Vorstellung blos eine theologische Theorie vereinzelter Rabbinen geblieben ist *und zur Zeit Jesu dem religiösen Volksbewusstsein der Juden ganz fern lag*, sondern namentlich auch dass die von den Juden als möglich angenommenen Wehen des Messias, welche er an der Spitze seines Volkes in der Zeit des Kampfes gegen die Weltmächte um die Herstellung des messianischen Reiches durchmachen muss und durch welche er zum Sieg und zur Herrlichkeit hindurchdringt, ihrer Art nach ganz verschieden sind von den Leiden, welche Jesus gerade durch die Häupter des Volkes Israel erfährt und welchen er, äusserlich betrachtet, im Tode erliegt.'

It is evident how keenly sensible Schwegler was of the difficulty presented by 1 Cor. i. 23, and similar verses, and also by the famous passage in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (see above, chap. i. p. 34), but as the death on the Cross could not be denied, he supposes that the Christians created the belief in Christ's future coming in glory in order to compensate for the ignominy of the fact of the Crucifixion, and for what the present denied to them (*Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, i. 110). See also Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 145, 149, 150, 6th edit. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 308, ff.; J. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, esp. pp. 356, 357, 1877; Row, *Jesus of the Evangelists*, 4th edit. pp. 140 ff. and 213 ff.; *Pseudepigrapha* (W. J. Deane: T. and T. Clark, 1891), pp. 82, 127, 153, 157, 189; Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 192, for the incompatibility of a suffering Messiah with Jewish ideas and expectations. Comp. Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 30, 31, 109.

[1] Ernest Naville, *Le Christ*, p. 200, who emphasises this fact in quoting the famous passage, Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44. Upon the historical character of the facts relating to the Crucifixion, see Steinmeyer, *Die Geschichte der Passion des Herrn*, p. 100, where he points out that just as the *Evangelia Infantiæ* are one of the strongest proofs of the historical character of the Gospel records of the Nativity, so the same may be said of the *Acta Pilati* as compared with the Gospel narratives of the Passion; for some account of the *Acta Pilati* see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 33, 34, and iii. 569, 570.

An interesting passage in Matheson's 'Historical Christ of St. Paul'

the preaching of a Crucified Christ have taken root upon such an unpromising soil? How could it have been planted and watered by pious Jews—a St. Peter or a St. John or a St. Paul—unless it had been endowed with a more than human vitality? If, indeed, it had its true source in no holy ground of this world, in no city made with hands—if, as the seer beheld the New Jerusalem, it had descended out of heaven from God; if its Founder, though crucified through weakness, was the Living One who became dead, and who was living for evermore, then and then only is it intelligible how *Christ Crucified* could become to the Jew 'the *power* of God,' to the Greek 'the *wisdom* of God' (1 Cor. ii. 24, 25).

But of the Christ thus crucified through weakness, the Creed tells us that He was 'dead and buried': and evidently in the belief of St. Paul, no less than in that of the Evangelists, the crucifixion of the Saviour issued in death;[1] of the brief Creed which Paul delivered to the Corinthians, and which he states that he had himself received, the first Article expresses this belief (1 Cor. xv. 3), and critics who minimise St. Paul's acquaintance with the details of the earthly life of Jesus eagerly maintain that the Apostle's teaching was centred around the two great facts of His death and resurrection.[2] It is not too much to affirm that the reality of the death upon the Cross would never have been disputed, in the face of the unanimous testimony of all our sources, had it not occurred to rationalism to transform the miracle of the resurrection into the reawakening of one who was only apparently dead.[3]

No one recognises more plainly than Strauss that a half-dead Christ creeping out of his tomb could never have impressed the disciples with the belief that he was the conqueror of death and the grave, the Prince of Life; such a revivification would only weaken the previous impression

(*Expositor*, i. 356, 2nd series) shows us how easily, if we had no reference to the Crucifixion outside our Gospels, the doctrine of a Crucified Messiah might have been fitted into the mythical system of Strauss, and grafted upon the famous passage in which Plato describes the sufferings of the Perfect Man, his scourging, his crucifixion (Plato, *Republic*, ii. 361).

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 14, 20; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 59.

[2] See above, chap. ii.

[3] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 590.

which Jesus had made upon his disciples, and it could not possibly have transformed their sorrow into enthusiasm, or have raised their reverence to adoration.[1] In the same manner Keim dwells upon the impossibility of believing that the poor, weak, sick Jesus, scarcely able to support himself upon his feet, hiding and disguised, finally succumbing to death, could have been an object of the faith, of the exalted emotion, of the triumph of his followers, a risen conqueror and Son of God! Such a theory is too paltry and absurd to hold its ground, since it makes the Apostles either miserably deceived, or associates them with Jesus as themselves deceivers.[2]

But St. Paul in 'the first Creed of Christendom' insists upon the burial no less than upon the death of Jesus, and it may well be described as arbitrary in the face of Paul's repeated testimony (comp. *e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 4; Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12) to question the fact of that burial.[3] Even Strauss admits that there is nothing historical to be alleged against the Christian tradition known to Paul, viz. that Jesus was buried after He had been taken down from the Cross;[4] whilst Keim not only maintains that the burial in itself is beyond doubt, but also protests as strongly as Steinmeyer against the arbitrary assumption that Isaiah liii. 9 is sufficient to

[1] *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. 378.

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 576, and notes, and comp. the remarks of Schanz in *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 401, Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 640, on the theory that the death of Jesus was not a reality. See also Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 339.

[3] So Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 526. Comp. Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 441, as against Strauss, and esp. 448; also in *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 228, 1870, and Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 14, 20, for Paul's agreement with the Gospels. The comment of Dr. Weiss on the repeated emphasis laid by Paul upon the burial of Jesus, is important: 'Dass er das Begräbniss Christi wiederholt betont (1 Cor. xv. 4, Röm. vi. 4; vgl. Act. xiii. 29, Col. ii. 12) hängt damit zusammen, dass dieses ebenso die Wirklichkeit seines Todes wie seiner Auferstehung garantirt und darum gleich bedeutsam ist für die beiden grossen Heilsthatsachen seines Systems' (*Bibl. Theol. des. N. T.* p. 290, note, 5. Aufl.). On the force of the repetition of ὅτι before ἐτάφη in 1 Cor. xv. 4 see Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 630. Comp. also Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 59; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 236, 1864; Schenkel, *Das Christusbild der Apostel*, pp. 251, note, 285; C. Uhlhorn, *ubi supra*, p. 172.

[4] Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, p. 364; comp. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 506–508; Hettinger, *Lehrbuch der Fundamental-Theologie*, i. 368.

account for the story of the entombment of the body of Jesus by a rich disciple like Joseph of Arimathæa: 'thus there remains to the Lord His Joseph's tomb, His honourable burial: and criticism leaves Him at least His grave and His rest.'[1]

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 526, 527: 'So bleibe dem Herrn sein Josephsgrab, sein Ehrengrab; und die Kritik lasse ihm wenigstens sein Grab und seine Ruhe' (p. 527).

CHAPTER VII

THE RESURRECTION

NOWHERE is there a closer parallel between the wording of the Creeds and the testimony of the Epistles than in St. Paul's assertion of our Lord's Resurrection. 'The third day He rose again from the dead'—or, as the Nicene Creed expresses it, 'the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures'—must recall to everyone the statement in 1 Cor. xv. 4: 'He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.' It is not proposed to attempt an examination in detail of the various passages in which St. Paul refers to the Resurrection of Jesus, the central truth of Christianity, the foundation of the Christian Church, and of the Apostles' preaching. But that which has been called St. Paul's chief testimony, every word of which, as Christlieb expressed it, breathes a firm and joyous conviction of its truth, commands the most serious consideration (1 Cor. xv. 3–8). The phrase in the very commencement of the statement, 'according to the Scriptures,' has been quoted to show that the expected fulfilment of prophecy created the belief that Jesus had risen. But the language of Old Testament prophecy was totally inadequate to produce such a belief,[1] and even if it had led to the expectation of a resurrection of Jesus, we have not only to account for that expectation, but for the way in which it is said to have been realised. There was nothing in the

[1] Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* p. 30; Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, pp. 398, 402; Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, esp. pp. 20, 137; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 292–296; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 441, 442; see also his important remarks in *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 19 ff., 229, 230, 1874; Stanton, *Jewish and Christian Messiah*, pp. 289, 290, 381.

Old Testament records, or in the current Jewish ideas, to suggest the account given us by the Evangelists (and, we may add, by St. Paul).[1]

Weizsäcker, indeed, has tried to show that Herod's fear that John the Baptist had risen from the dead, and the commonly expressed opinion that Jesus might be Himself the Baptist, are instances of a current belief in the idea that the dead might rise again and appear on earth ; but, on his own showing, such an idea only involved that the dead restored to life should live and work anew for a long time in an earthly manner.[2] Such a representation is no parallel to the account given us in the Gospels of the resurrection of Christ : being raised from the dead He dieth no more, He

[1] With the well-known remarks of Dr. Edersheim on this point, and his argument that the Resurrection of Christ as it actually took place was quite foreign to Jewish ideas (cf. *Jesus the Messiah*, vol. ii. 624, 625), we may compare the criticism of Hettinger : 'Visionen und Hallucinationen sind nur der Ausdruck geläufiger Ideen ; die Vorstellung einer Auferstehung von den Todten vor der allgemeinen Auferstehung widersprach vollständig dem Ideenkreise der Juden. Henoch und Elias sind hinweggenommen zu Gott, aber nicht gestorben und wieder auferstanden. Niemand hat aber Visionen von dem, was seinen Vorstellungen fremd ist, ja geradezu widerspricht' (*Fundamental-Theologie oder Apologetik*, Bd. i. p. 368, 1879) ; and also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 604 : 'Die ganze Vorstellung von einem Auferstehen zum himmlischen Leben war doch jener Zeit noch völlig fremd, die nur von einer Wiedererweckung zum irdischen Leben oder von einer Fortdauer der Seele im Jenseits wusste (vgl. Bach, iv. 180 f.) ; aber nicht von einer Auferstehung, wie sie Jesus dachte und verhiess. . . . Erst durch die thatsächliche Ueberführung von der leibhaftigen Auferstehung Jesu konnte die ihrer Zeit ganz fernliegende Vorstellung von einem himmlischen Fortleben Jesu in verklärter Leiblichkeit in ihnen begründet und zum Fundamente der christlichen Auferstehungshoffnung werden.' Comp. also Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 345, 357, and Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 75.

Steinmeyer (*ubi supra*, p. 137), Beyschlag (*Leben Jesu*, i. 450), and Weiss (*Leben Jesu*, ii. 294), no less than English Apologists like Dr. Milligan (*Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 95), insist upon the importance of John xi. 24, as showing that the resurrection, although not a fact strange to the Jewish consciousness, was not expected by them until the last day.

For the difficulty of accounting for St. Paul's belief on the ground of his Pharisaic ideas of a resurrection, see Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 626, and comp. p. 294 ; Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, p. 137, and Beyschlag, note 1, *ibid.* ; and see also Hase's remarks in connection with St. Paul, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 593. The remarks of Steinmeyer are of special value against both Holsten and Strauss, and their attempts to derive Paul's belief in the Resurrection from the ideas in vogue among the Pharisees (Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. 385, 5th edit.).

[2] Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 7.

rises to an immortal and not to a mortal life, to a life which is best described as wholly new in kind and issue.[1]

In itself the addition 'according to the Scriptures,' as Paret remarks, damages just as little the historical fact of the resurrection, as it does the historical character of the death and burial of Jesus, and at all events it shows us St. Paul in entire agreement with the Evangelists and with Jesus Himself.[2] It is also to be observed that St. Paul's language, both here and elsewhere, lays stress, not merely upon certain facts, but upon their moral and spiritual import—Christ not only dies, but He dies *for our sins*, and therefore the formula 'according to the Scriptures' finds its true explanation in a moral necessity, which is expressed in Christ's own words upon the significance of His Passion and the glory which should follow: 'thus it *must* be' (Matt. xxvi. 54; Luke xxiv. 26).[3]

No doubt there is a difficulty in making the hopes of the disciples revive so speedily—hopes which had been buried in the grave with Jesus—*if* the third day is to be regarded as marking the first appearance of the Risen Lord, and an easy solution is sought for this difficulty by transferring this first appearance to Galilee, where at a distance from the scenes of His shameful death, the expectation of a vision of their Master might have been created, as the fond memories of the disciples still lingered over the past.[4] Such a solution

[1] Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 118, 157; and compare Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 294, where he points out that it was just that Pharisaic idea of a resurrection to earthly life which Jesus so strenuously controverted (Mark xii. 24); what Jesus meant by rising from the dead (an expression which even His trusted friends could not understand, Mark ix. 10) was something entirely new in the world, something which the disciples would only comprehend when the fact of the Resurrection had made it intelligible to them; he did indeed rise from the grave with His body, and appear to His disciples; but it was not to recommence an earthly life, and in a perishable body again to die as all that is earthly dies; exempt from the limitations of this earthly life, and straightway transferred to a heavenly, He could continue His activity in a new way, and with far different results.

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 20.

[3] Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, pp. 16, 17; and Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 208.

[4] So Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, i. 400, 401, 5. Aufl.; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. pp. 533, 534: Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 15. But compare Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 12–18 (Vorwort); and see also Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 594.

not only does violence to the unanimous tradition of the Evangelists, it breaks down under the weight of fresh impossibilities, and fails to commend itself to Hilgenfeld and Holsten, who maintain that the first appearances took place, not in Galilee, but in Jerusalem.[1]

But in this connection there is one historical fact which demands an explanation, viz. the institution of the Christian Sunday. 'The first day of the week' is an expression used not by one but by each of the Evangelists, as also by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (cf. Acts xx. 7). Whatever date we assign to the Gospels, it is evident that this day—'the first day of the week'—must have had some meaning for Christians when St. Paul wrote his letter just quoted to the Church at Corinth; he had already, it seems, prescribed the same day for the Churches of Galatia (see xvi. 1), and he does not consider it necessary to give any reason for its selection. But if on the third day, *i.e.* the first day of the week, Jesus Christ rose again according to the Scriptures, then we can understand how men like St. Paul and St. John, with all their Jewish instincts and Jewish training, could centre the thoughts of Christians, not upon the Jewish Sabbath, but upon the first day of the week, as the day of holy communion with their Risen Lord, and of holy and loving intercourse with one another.[2]

[1] 'Da die dem Jakobus geschehene Erscheinung nur in Jerusalem zu denken ist, so wird auch die vorhergehende und unmittelbar sich anschliessende in Jerusalem gedacht sein; sonst hätte Paulus hier, wo alles auf das thatsächliche ankam, gewiss die Ortsveränderung angegeben.' Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 412, 1880; Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theol.* 1868, p. 73. Comp. also Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 421–423.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 59: 'Cette résurrection a eu lieu le troisième jour. Que nous ayons ici une indication historique, et non l'application d'un mot prophétique c'est ce que prouve le fait de la substitution dans les églises pauliniennes du jour du dimanche au jour du sabbat.' Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 20: 'Schon die genaue Zeitbestimmung fehlt nicht: am dritten Tage nach seinem Tode ist, ganz übereinstimmend mit den Evangelien, nach dieser Stelle (1 Cor. xv. 4) Christus wiederbelebt worden. Demgemäss wurde auch in den paulinischen Gemeinden der erste Wochentag als der heilige Tag der Christen gefeiert (1 Cor. xvi. 2), und wir haben so neben der christlichen Beschneidung (Col. ii. 11) dem christlichen Passah (1 Cor. v. 7), auch in den paulinischen Gemeinden schon den christlichen Sabbat.'

To the same effect Thenius in *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, p. 70;

When we turn to the Christophanies enumerated by St. Paul in the few succeeding verses, a number of questions at once demand an answer. How fully, *e.g.*, does this series of appearances harmonise with those of the Gospels? or, what was St. Paul's object in making his selection? is the last-mentioned appearance, to himself, to be placed on a level with those vouchsafed to the earlier Apostles?

Now, in the first place, it is needful to remind ourselves again that St. Paul is writing a letter—a letter which presupposes an acquaintance with the gospel which he had preached, and which would not therefore be likely to contain more than a summary of facts already communicated to the Corinthian Church.[1] Thus, while Keim attaches even more weight to the Pauline testimony to our Lord's resurrection than many Christian Apologists, he has surely forgotten this consideration when he positively states that Paul has with set purpose excluded from his account of the Resurrection appearances the speaking of Jesus, His sitting and walking with His disciples, His eating with them, His permission to them to handle Him, and every representation of His previous corporeity, and of His fellowship with His disciples. All this is done designedly by St. Paul, in Keim's view, in order to show that he regards the appearance of Jesus to His disciples as exactly similar to the appearance vouchsafed to him, viz. a dazzling and momentary revelation of the Son of God in Heaven in His

and Huraut, *Paul a-t-il connu le Christ historique?* p. 20; see also Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 602, 603, Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 441, Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 644.

Amongst English writers see especially Milligan, *Lectures on the Resurrection*, pp. 67-69, and Maclear, *The Evidential Value of the Observance of the Lord's Day* ('Present Day Tracts'), 54.

If the statement in Acts xx. 7, is dismissed as unhistorical, the expression used in Rev. i. 7 cannot be disregarded by critics who are prepared to accept the Johannine authorship of this latter book (see Weiss, *ubi supra*), nor can there be any reasonable doubt that as early as the time of Ignatius 'the Lord's Day' was identical with 'the first day of the week' (*Dict. of Christian Antiq.* ii. 1042).

[1] Paret, 'Das Zeugniss des Apostels Paulus über die ihm gewordene Christus-Erscheinung,' in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1859, p. 245; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 626; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 218, 1864; and Matheson, 'Historical Christ of St. Paul,' in *Expositor*, ii. 38 (2nd series).

glorified body. The proof of this determined exclusion of the Gospel narratives by St. Paul is based by Keim upon what he calls the measured, reserved, and scanty expression 'was seen' (ὤφθη).[1]

Certainly in the statement 'and that he was seen of Cephas' (1 Cor. xv. 5), it is not only evident that the mention of such an interview is in perfect harmony with the narrative of St. Luke (xxiv. 34),[2] but it is also significant that both Luke and Paul alike content themselves with a brief reference to this incident. It has recently been pointed out with much force what room there was here for mythical embellishment in the place of two brief intimations,[3] and we are able to see, not only in the work on the Resurrection ascribed to Justin Martyr, but more plainly still in the 'Acta Pilati' how far men's fancies could carry them.[4]

But it is difficult to believe that this mention of the appearance to Peter would have been so meagre if indeed he had played the leading part in the Resurrection history which is assigned to him by recent criticism.[5] According to Weizsäcker, *e.g.*, it is no longer an hysterical woman, as Renan suggested, but Peter who first believes that he has seen the Risen Lord, and who communicates this assurance to his fellow-disciples. But we have been well reminded that the selection of St. Peter to bear this burden of contagious belief is by no means judicious.[6] It is not only that the

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. p. 540. Comp. Beyschlag's criticism in *Leben Jesu*, i. 430, and his remarks in *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 221–223, 1864; Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 20, 21. On this word ὤφθη and its employment in the New Testament, see note, p. 265, in Dr. Milligan's *Resurrection of our Lord*.

[2] Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396.

[3] Maclear, *Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*, pp. 297–300; cf. the remarks of Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, pp. 166, 167.

[4] See the instances given by Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. pp. 568–570.

[5] W. F. Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk entwickelt aus Christi Selbstzeugniss und den Zeugnissen der Apostel*, p. 15 (Vorwort), 1887.

[6] Gess points out with much force (*ubi supra*, pp. 16, 17), that according to Weizsäcker the Fourth Gospel was composed by a disciple of St. John soon after his Master's death; but if, as Weizsäcker would have us believe, the appearances of the Risen Lord took place in Galilee, and only as visions, how is it that a Gospel written by a disciple of St. John should introduce some woman, then Peter and the beloved disciple, as finding the grave empty, and that a series of appearances, comprising one occasion on which Jesus offered Himself as an object to be handled, should be represented as taking place in Jerusalem?

difficulty of accounting for this confident conviction on the part of St. Peter presses heavily upon those who deny that our Lord ever definitely predicted His Resurrection,[1] it is not only that St. Paul's silence as to the earlier appearances in Jerusalem is interpreted to mean his total ignorance of the empty grave and of the events of the first Easter day, and thus to make room for a vision to St. Peter in Galilee ;[2] but the theory seems to contradict all our ordinary experiences of human nature. What the apparent degradation of the death of Jesus upon the Cross must have been to His disciples ; how utterly it must have extinguished all their courage and all their hopes ; how difficult it is to rekindle the flame of a dead enthusiasm, and the more difficult in proportion to the greatness of its former life and power—all this is forgotten in the attempt to make Simon Peter the founder of the Christian Church. But how unlikely that men so crushed and disappointed should have recovered from their despondency by the mere fantasies of a comrade who in the very hour of trial had least approved himself![3] Contrast with this unlikely supposition the actual narrative of the Gospels.

There St. Peter does not hasten to place himself at the head of his fellow-disciples in unseemly eagerness, and with no assurance of forgiveness for his past failure and denial. We see him passing from the high-priest's palace into the night, not like Judas into the night of darkness and despair, but in bitter tears of repentance to meet the coming dawn. That the Saviour should appear to him first of all His disciples was surely no strange action on the part of Him who came, not to break the bruised reed, but to impart an unfailing strength : that such a meeting and its message of forgiveness should be treasured by Peter in the inmost sanctuary of his heart, in the deep silence of humility and gratitude ; that he should wait until the Lord again restored him in public to his authority in the Apostolic College : all this, we may

[1] See an article by Deck upon 1 Cor. xv. 3–8, in connection with Weizsäcker's theory in *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*, x. Jahrgang, 1889, 1. Heft, pp. 44, 46.

[2] Gess, *ubi supra*, pp. 12, 13.

[3] *Theologische Studien*, *ubi supra*, pp. 49, 54.

reverently say, is in accordance with the mind of Christ, and with the divine fitness of things.[1]

But if we can thus see a reason why our Lord vouchsafed a special appearance to St. Peter, we can also see, from another point of view, why St. Paul should refer to it. It is not very fanciful to suppose that this appearance of the Risen Lord was an earnest theme of conversation during Paul's visit to Jerusalem recorded in Gal. i. 18, especially when we remember that this was his first meeting with any member of the Twelve, and that his reference to it seems to indicate the purpose of careful and searching inquiry.[2] But the same Epistle to the Galatians records a meeting at Jerusalem, not only between Paul and Peter, but also between Paul and James (Gal. i. 19); and if Paul afterwards mentions plainly two appearances vouchsafed by the Risen Christ to Peter and James, this mention is in striking agreement with the fact that Paul had himself conferred personally with these two Apostles when he first visited Jerusalem after his conversion.[3]

[1] *Theologische Studien*, *ubi supra*, pp. 55, 56, and comp. the remarks of Gess on the appearance to Peter, p. 18, *ubi supra*: 'Die Vermuthung liegt nahe, dass diese Erscheinung für Petrus dem tief gefallenen, tief zerknirschten gegolten habe, durch eine besondere Huld ihn aufrichten. Kam ihr diese sehr persönliche Bedeutung zu, so ist das Zurücktreten in der Gemeindeüberlieferung leicht zu verstehen.'

[2] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 119, 2. Aufl., where he refers to Paret's first treatise, *Paulus und Jesus*. Comp. also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol.* p. 200, 5. Aufl.; Schenkel, *Das Christusbild*, p. 59; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, i. 30, 2nd edit.; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 60; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 532; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 429; Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 592; and amongst recent English writers, Matheson, *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 114–117, 121, 131–133; for the great importance of this visit in its bearing upon Paul's information as to the facts of the life of Jesus. Lipsius, although he limits the result of the visit to Paul's making the acquaintance of Peter, yet maintains its historical truthfulness as against Steck, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. zweite Abtheilung, p. 16, 1891.

On the force of the word ἱστορῆσαι, see Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 60, and Edersheim, *Jesus the Messiah*, ii. 625: also *Expositor*, July 1889, p. 56. Comp., however, Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift fur wissensch. Theol.* p. 96, 1864 (see above, chap. ii. p. 42).

[3] 'If Paul afterwards speaks plainly of two appearances which were granted to Peter and James, this agrees well with the fact that it was with these two men he had conferred personally during his first stay at Jerusalem after his conversion' (Godet, 1 *Corinthians*, p. 330, E. T.). So, too, Row, *Christian Evidences*,

But whilst St. Paul may with some probability be supposed to be giving a chronological, there is surely no reason to conclude that he is giving an exhaustive, list of our Lord's appearances after His Resurrection ;[1] and we need not, therefore, be over-anxious to identify the two appearances which he mentions, (1) to the Twelve, (2) to all the Apostles, with any specific appearances narrated in our Gospels.

Two appearances at least amongst those to which St. Paul refers are not further mentioned in the New Testament—the appearance to James, and that to above five hundred brethren at once : the former is nowhere described except in the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,'[2] whilst we can by no means be sure as to the identity of the latter with Matt. xxviii. 16, where the eleven are expressly mentioned,[3] and the attempt to refer it to the events of the first Christian Pentecost is arbitrary in the extreme.[4]

No doubt when St. Paul speaks of 'the twelve,' he may be referring to such an appearance as that narrated in Luke xxiv. 36, John xx. 19 ; and the term 'the twelve' is easily accounted for on the ground that Paul was using a corporate term, a familiar designation of the first disciples of Jesus, although at the time in question the number was not absolutely exact.[5] With regard to the appearance 'to all the

Bampton Lectures, pp. 324–327 ; and Matheson, *ubi supra*. On this appearance, see Nicholson, *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, pp, 62–68, 78 ; and comp. for a different estimate, Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 166 ; and Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 480, E. T. (Steinmeyer considers it more than probable that this appearance was vouchsafed to James the son of Zebedee, a view which has not commended itself to modern criticism, p. 167.)

[1] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 617 ; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 429, and note ; Meyer, *Die Corintherbriefe*, p. 418 ; Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 654 ; see, however, Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 142 ; Matheson, 'Historical Christ of St. Paul,' in *Expositor* ii. (2nd series) p. 38 ; Neander, *Life of Christ*, pp. 482 f. E. T.

[2] See, however, Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396 ; and P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 77, and reference to Resch's proposed identification of James and Thomas.

[3] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 23 ; but comp. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 618, 619, and Didon, *Jésus-Christ*, ii. 369.

[4] Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, p. 13 ; Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 186.

[5] Meyer, *ubi supra*, p. 415 ; Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 479, E. T. ; and comp. *Kurzgefasster Commentar*, p. 201, dritte Abtheilung, 1887 ; and see above, chap. v.

Apostles' it has been sometimes thought that the word 'all' points to some occasion when Thomas was present with his fellow-disciples (John xx. 26). But on the other hand, the fact that this appearance is recorded by Paul immediately after that of James, as if Paul included him also in the term 'all the Apostles,' and the fact that the term 'Apostle' is sometimes applied more widely than to the original Twelve (although, as here, it may include them) has led others to refer this appearance to the time of the Ascension, or to some occasion the details of which are not recorded.[1]

But if we cannot identify the appearance to more than five hundred brethren with Matt. xxviii. 16, there is no reason why we should not suppose that it took place in Galilee, and that the number 500 included many Galilean believers. We can thus explain the comparatively small number (120) in Acts i. 15, since it would be limited to the members of the Church in Jerusalem.[2] But it is of additional interest to notice the insight which Paul's appeal to these five hundred brethren gives us of the evidential character of the Apostle's mind, and also of his conscientiousness and circumspection in using his evidence: he will not overstate his case, the greater part of his witnesses remain and they can be examined, but some are fallen asleep (verse 6).[3]

[1] Matheson, *ubi supra*; 1 Corinthians in Ellicott's *Commentary*, vol. ii. p. 346; but comp. Meyer, *ubi supra*, pp. 417, 418; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 622, 623. See, also, Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 361; *Kurzgefasster Commentar, ubi supra*; Nicholson, *ubi supra*, p. 63.

[2] Comp. esp. for this point of view, Meyer, 1 *Cor.* p. 416, and *Kurzgefasster Commentar, ubi supra*; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 422; Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396.

[3] Meyer, 1 *Cor.* p. 417; Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 619; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 429, 430; *Kurzgefasster Commentar, ubi supra*: 'In v. 6 freut P. sich sichtlich der grossen Wolke gewissen Zeugen, die noch clarer sich gegenseitig ergänzen und bestätigen, wegen des ἐφάπαξ; die Beifügung τινὲς δὲ κ.τ.λ. fliesst (ähnlich 1 Cor. i. 16) aus Gewissenhaftigkeit und Vorsicht: Uebertreibung könnte nachmals schädlich werden.' Comp. Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, p. 17 (Preface); Matheson, *ubi supra*, p. 42; Stanley's essay in his *Corinthians*; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 353. Speaking of this appearance, Weiss remarks (*ubi supra*), 'welche an sich schon jeden Gedanken an eine blosse Vision ausschliesst, zumal Paulus ohne Zweifel von der Mehrzahl der Augenzeugen derselben, welche zu seiner Zeit noch lebten, Viele selbst gesprochen hatte.' See especially Mangold's note in Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 476, 4. Aufl.

With regard to the narrative of the Resurrection appearances, as it is recorded in one of our Gospels (viz. St. Luke's), it is of interest to note that Holtzmann has expressed his opinion that, granted the dependence of Luke upon Paul, Luke xxiv. and 1 Cor. xv. 1–7 are mutually explainable. Thus Luke relates expressly the history of the appearance to which Paul probably alludes in 1 Cor. xv. 7, if we suppose that by this James is meant the younger disciple who went with his father called Cleopas (Alphæus) to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 18). In the meanwhile, as the two disciples were on their return journey from Emmaus, the Lord appeared to Simon (Luke xxiv. 34 = 1 Cor. xv. 5), and directly afterwards He was seen by the whole circle of the disciples (Luke xxiv. 36 = 1 Cor. xv. 5). With this appearance Luke concludes in his Gospel, where he adds later-spoken words of Jesus without further specification of the different occasions to which they were to be referred. Paul, however, mentions the appearance to more than five hundred brethren at once, and Holtzmann thinks that these were visitors who had come up to Jerusalem at the Passover, and so this appearance must be closely connected with those previously mentioned. At this point the appearance vouchsafed to James would find a place in the list, in case it cannot be referred to the incident of the walk to Emmaus. Finally, Jesus also, according to Luke, granted an appearance 'to all the Apostles,' as Paul describes it (1 Cor. xv. 8), because he intends now to rank himself amongst them. We may not be prepared to endorse all Holtzmann's reasoning, but his conclusion that in relation to the Resurrection history Paul and Luke are in closer agreement than any two other of the five reports which we possess is of unmistakable importance.[1]

But even if any attempt to bring the appearances of the Risen Christ as they are recorded in the Gospels into close relation with the passage in 1 Cor. xv. 1–7 must remain a 'crux' for the Harmonists,[2] yet is it not quite possible to find

[1] *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 396.

[2] P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 23. Comp. also the recent remarks of Schmiedel on these harmonistic attempts, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. erste Abtheilung, 2. Hälfte, p. 155, 1891.

some principle of selection which determined the list given us by Paul? If he intended to make an impression upon the Corinthian doubters by an appeal to eye-witnesses of the Risen Jesus, nothing is more easily intelligible than that he should refer to names well known in Corinth. This would have been the case in his appeal to Cephas, whose name one party in the Corinthian Church seems to have claimed as its own; so, too, in referring to 'the twelve,' Paul appealed to witnesses of recognised weight and authority; so, too, in referring to James, whose testimony would have commended itself to the Christ-party, if, as Weizsäcker supposes, the members of it had inscribed upon their banner the name of Christ, as He walked in the flesh and was attested by eye-witnesses such as this James 'the brother of the Lord.' We can understand, too, how over and above these names the 'more than five hundred brethren at once' would be considered by Paul as important witnesses, when we bear in mind how something seen by hundreds at once commends itself to a sound human judgment as something real, a case in which there is no deception.[1] On the other hand, an appeal to the testimony of some women in other respects quite unknown to them would have had no effect upon the Corinthians, and it is therefore easily intelligible that the narrative in John xx. might have been familiar to the Apostle and yet that all mention of it might have been omitted by him on this occasion.[2]

[1] 'Fünfhundert, und nicht ein kühler Kopf, der nicht sieht, was die Andern doch nur zu sehen glauben' (Mangold, *ubi supra*).

[2] See Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 17, 18 (Vorwort), 1887, for these arguments. To the same effect Schanz, *Gott und die Offenbarung*, p. 402; Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, p. 55; and Roos, *ubi supra*, p. 63, in answer to Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 185. Schanz points out that Paul does not mention the women, because, in marshalling his proofs for the Corinthians, *i.e.* for those who had been prejudiced against him on behalf of the original Apostles by means of Judaistic emissaries, the appeal to men, to the original Apostles themselves, would naturally be of special efficacy. Comp. also Beyschlag on the selection made by Paul, *Leben Jesu*, i. 429. On the importance of the testimony of the five hundred, and of the verse which mentions it, 1 Cor. xv. 6, see esp. Mangold's note, *ubi supra*, against Holsten and the supporters of the vision-hypothesis; P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 157; Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 648.

But whilst we may be content to abandon the attempts to harmonise the narratives of our Gospels with 1 Cor. xv., yet it may be fairly alleged that there is nothing in the latter passage which conflicts with the Gospels and their proofs of the Lord's Resurrection; on the contrary, it confirms the Gospels in two collateral circumstances of the greatest importance, it emphasises the burial of Jesus, and accordingly explains the Resurrection as a coming forth from the grave, and it places the Resurrection and the first appearances of the Risen One 'on the third day.' Nothing can be plainer than that Paul feels himself to be in entire agreement with the Twelve and with the common tradition (1 Cor. xv. 3, 11).[1]

But we pass to the consideration of the Christophany granted to Paul himself: 'And last of all he was seen of me also' (1 Cor. xv. 8). The importance of the passage in relation to the narratives of the Gospels is unmistakable, for as the Apostle uses the same word ὤφθη of each of the appearances mentioned in the preceding verses, it is assumed that they, too, partook of the same visionary character which is so recklessly ascribed to the appearance to St. Paul.

To bear out this assumption, the narratives of Paul's conversion in the Acts are without ceremony dismissed as untrustworthy;[2] the testimony of St. Paul to the nature of the appearance of the Risen Christ is compared to the sparse and brief declarations in one or two of the Epistles which may still be regarded as genuine, and then the other appearances mentioned in the Gospels are measured in accordance with the scanty statements of these Epistles. And since—so it is argued—Paul was specially inclined to visions and ecstatic conditions; since he was a man of great

[1] Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 429, 431, comp. 68: Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 60, 61; H. Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 209.

[2] Upon the differences of detail in the three accounts of Paul's conversion, and their compatibility with the truthfulness of the narrative, reference may be made to Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 36–39; Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, 3. Aufl. pp. 264–268; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, p. 17 ('La Conversion de Saul'), 2nd edit.; Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 310, 5. Aufl.; and upon the arbitrary treatment of these differences, see Paret, 'Die Christuserscheinung des Apostels Paulus,' &c., in *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* p. 241, 1859; and Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 209 ff. 1864.

nervous excitability, and at any rate of little critical judgment; and since in 1 Cor. xv. he relates nothing of bodily manifestations of the Risen One such as the Gospels narrate, we are in possession of all the means for pushing back the Christophanies from the objective to the subjective world, from history to psychology, from knowledge to mere opinion, and the most illuminating fact in the world's history is dismissed with the cold formula that what it is in itself cannot be the subject of historical inquiry.[1]

But let us confine ourselves as much as possible to the criticism which only accepts the statements of the Pauline Epistles.[2]

1. The earliest passage in which St. Paul without doubt speaks of his conversion is Gal. i. 15, 16. But here it is important to notice (as we shall see in discussing the Apostle's later references to the same event) that he combines two facts, an inner illumination, and an outward mission succeeding. Such words express both the value and the aim of Paul's conversion; it was but fitting that the man who could always think of his Christian life as a life 'in Christ,' should describe its commencement as the revelation of Christ in him, and that he should refer the origin of what afterwards became the special characteristic of his work to a divine commission, and also, as in 1 Cor. xv. 10, to divine grace. But we cannot isolate the expression 'to reveal his Son in me' (ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ), and then build upon it alone a theory which reduces Paul's conversion to a mere subjective process. No doubt it is quite true that the Apostle is not here describing the means which God employed to carry out his good pleasure, but it is to be noted that in the very first verse of the Epistle, Gal. i. 1, he speaks of himself as 'Paul, an Apostle, not of men, neither by man,

[1] Paret, 'Das Zeugniss des Apostels Paulus über die ihm gewordene Christuserscheinung,' in *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* p. 240, 1859, with reference to the remark of Baur: 'Was die Auferstehung an sich ist, liegt ausserhalb des Kreises der geschichtlichen Untersuchung' (*Geschichte des Christenthums*, p. 39). No wonder that Beyschlag speaks of this as 'ein Dahingestelltseinlassen, bei dem freilich weder Freund noch Feind sich beruhigen konnte.'

[2] For section marked 1, see Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 242, 243.

but by Jesus Christ and God the Father,' so that whilst in verse 16 Christ appears only as an object of the divine activity, in this opening declaration He appears as the immediate agent to whom St. Paul owes his calling as an Apostle, and indeed the name of Christ is introduced even before the name of God. Again in verse 12 of this first chapter, Jesus Christ is not only the object of the divine revelation as in verse 16, but its author; otherwise, we cannot preserve the antithesis upon which the Apostle is evidently insisting.

But in the attempt to isolate the expression ἀ π ο κ. κ.τ.λ. we not only lose the force of preceding verses, but also the force of the immediate context.[1] In the next verse (17) there is one most significant word, which throws a flood of light upon the whole passage, the word 'again' (πάλιν): 'neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus.'

How can the word πάλιν be explained, except upon the supposition that even as he spoke of God revealing His Son in him (verse 16) there flashed before the gaze of the Apostle one definite particular act in the past, and the birthplace of his new life—the road to Damascus? But if the event of his conversion had been purely internal, the recollection of the locality where it happened would scarcely have forced itself so much into the foreground so many years after, so that even when describing in general terms the inward nature of his change Paul thought perforce at the same moment of Damascus.[2]

[1] Beyschlag remarks upon Baur's omission to take any notice of the preceding words, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, 'and called me by his grace,' Gal. i. 15; and if Paul, under the idea of a κλῆσις, 'a calling,' always understands an act of divine influence upon men proceeding from without, and if Paul speaks of himself as 'called to be an Apostle' not by man, but by Jesus Christ, and so not by any human agent, does not this very passage, so far from containing a denial of any external incident in Paul's conversion, in reality demand some outward and immediate call from heaven like that in the narrative of the Acts, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?' (*Studien und Kritiken*, p. 220, 1864)?

[2] With these arguments of Paret Sabatier's remarks are in entire agreement, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 40, 41. So, too, Professor Massie in his article 'Conversion

2.[1] But even if in Gal. i. 15, 16, the Apostle lays the chief stress upon what may be called the internal side of his conversion, he insists not less exclusively upon its external and objective side in two passages in 1 Corinthians. Of these two passages the first, ch. ix. i., is sometimes explained as if it referred to a seeing of Jesus during the Saviour's earthly life, or to some appearance vouchsafed to the Apostle during his Christian course: and this latter explanation has been given even to the second passage, ch. xv. 8.

But here, again, serious misunderstanding arises from a forgetfulness of the immediate context: 'Am I not an Apostle? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' It is evident that the two facts, the fact of having seen the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fact of having been an Apostle, are mentioned, as it were, in the same breath, and that the one is an essential counterpart of the other. The commencement of an Apostleship implies one 'sending,' and if Paul could only have appealed to His inner calling and conversion, and not in equal measure to an external fact, his recognition as an Apostle would have been endangered every moment. In those days many were converted to Christianity without claiming the name of Apostles, and from the beginning the fundamental conception of an Apostle was that of one who had received an immediate personal commission from the Lord. The 'having seen Jesus,' then, to which Paul here refers is plainly such a seeing as coincided with his becoming an Apostle.[2] In the opening verses of 1 Cor. xv. St. Paul's thoughts again dwell upon the close connection between the

of St. Paul,' in *Expositor*, No. 58, 3rd series. Comp. the criticism of Steck, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 82, and Völter, *Die Composition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, p. 125.

[1] For sections 2, 3, and 4, see Paret, *ubi supra*.

[2] Beyschlag draws attention to the fact that Paul evidently ranked the office of an Apostle above that of a Prophet (1 Cor. xii. 28); but if the special characteristic of the latter both in the Old and New Testaments was to have seen visions of the Lord, it would seem that Paul must have based the higher office of an Apostle upon something more than a mere ὅραμα, upon a mere visionary 'seeing' the Lord: this emphatic precedence which Paul assigns to the Apostleship points to the fact that while a Prophet was granted an inward and spiritual revelation, an Apostle had also been witness of the actual bodily appearance of the Lord (*Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 223, 224, 1864). See further his remarks in *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 208, 1890, and *Leben Jesu*, i. 435.

Apostolic office and the appearance of the Risen Lord. And in this connection he introduces a remarkable expression: 'and last of all He appeared to me also as to one born out of due time' (ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι—verse 8). No word could remind us more forcibly of a violent sudden change, of the miraculous might of the revelation of Jesus Christ, and Paul himself thus paints for us in one graphic word his sudden arrest on his way to Damascus.[1]

3. It is sometimes objected that Paul nowhere defines clearly the mode and manner of the appearance of Jesus, and that he is far more reserved in his allusion to it in his Epistles than one would suppose in view of his detailed descriptions of his conversion in the Acts. But does not the Apostle's 'reserve' suggest that he had spoken freely and fully?'[2] In the opening

[1] On the force of the words ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι, Sabatier writes: 'Ces derniers mots doivent être relevés. Une seule interprétation est possible; c'est celle qu'en donnait déjà Grotius et que Baur a acceptée. Un ἔκτρωμα ne peut être qu'un fœtus arraché violemment avant terme au sein maternel; ce que Grotius exprime très heureusement dans ces mots: *hoc ideo dicit, quia non longa institutione ad Christianismum perductus fuit, quo esset velut naturalis partus, sed vi subita, quo modo immaturi partus ejici solent.*' 'Pourrait-on,' adds Sabatier, 'mieux indiquer le caractère objectif de la violence exercée sur l'âme de Paul au moment de sa conversion?' (*ubi supra*, pp. 41, 42).

Baur's remarks will be found in his *Paulus*, ii. 296, where he quotes with approval the explanation of Grotius, and comments as follows upon the expression ἔκτρωμα: 'Ein Ausdruck, welcher nicht von einer Spätgeburt, sondern nur von einer Fehlgeburt zu verstehen ist, aber auch von einer Fehlgeburt nicht so, wie wenn er damit seine Unwürdigkeit und Unfähigkeit zum Apostelamt bezeichnen wollte, dass er so wenig verdient habe, Apostel zu werden, als eine Fehlgeburt zu leben verdiene, sondern was er mit diesem Ausdruck sagen will, ist vielmehr, dass er auf eine gewaltsame Weise, wie eine Fehlgeburt, als Christ zur Welt geboren worden sei.'

Steinmeyer's lengthy note on the word ἔκτρωμα is also of interest and importance, both for his own explanation and for that of others (*Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, pp. 139, 140).

For a further exegesis of the passage, and for the force of the article before ἔκτρωμα, see also *Kurzgefasster Commentar N. T.* pp. 199, 201, dritte Abtheilung, 1887. Two articles on 'The Sense in which St. Paul calls himself an Ectroma,' in the *Expositor*, iii. (2nd series), pp. 268, 364, and Matheson's *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 69 ff., may also be consulted with interest.

[2] See Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 218, 1864. With regard to what is called the 'reserve' of Paul in speaking of his conversion, Beyschlag finds references to the event in 1 Cor. ix. 1, xv. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Gal. i. 1, 11–16; Phil. iii. 4–12, to say nothing of less positive allusions, and he adds that he does not know what more a critic could demand, especially a critic who accepts only four of the Pauline Epistles.

verses of 1 Cor. xv. he evidently points back to an earlier recital which he himself had made, and if his 'seeing' Jesus was so intimately bound up with his claim to be an Apostle, it would have been strange if he had omitted ἐν πρώτοις (1 Cor. xv. 3) all account of the facts upon which that claim was based, and had never mentioned them with something of the precision and detail which marks the narratives of the Acts.

4. But, it is argued, even if it be granted [1] that Paul, equally with the other Apostles of Jesus, believed himself to have seen the dead Christ restored to life, and to have seen Him in an objective manner, and if it be granted that this outward seeing of Jesus was for Paul a fact of equal importance with that inward revelation from which he distinguishes it, how can it be proved that it was really the Person of Jesus which he saw, and that his seeing was really an objective seeing? [2] Never, at any point, so it is maintained, do we pass beyond the self-consciousness and testimony of the Apostle, which no doubt he gives *bonâ fide*: 'we believe that he believed himself to have seen Jesus': this formula we may allow to stand, but we cannot know to what extent his perception was of an objective kind, and whether his deeply agitated religious self-consciousness did not at the same moment help to beget and form the vision of the glorified Jesus.

One of our own class, continues the objector, say a critic of imperturbable coolness and calmness, would perhaps deserve credence if he affirmed that he had seen before him a dead man alive, and in a bodily form, although even in such a case it would be necessary to make inquiries as to whether at that moment at which he claimed to have witnessed the appearance he was still a critic of the above character, or whether he had not rather dropped out of his part, and undergone a momentary destruction of his reasoning functions.[3]

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 246.

[2] See Mangold's note, *ubi supra*, and for his argument that 1 Cor. xv. 6 points plainly to an objective seeing, and that therefore the Christophany to Paul, which he places on an equal footing with that in verse 6, should also be regarded in the same light.

[3] Paret's description irresistibly reminds us of the conditions dem nded for

But an Apostle Paul who, it is admitted, not seldom falls into trances, received revelations, spoke with tongues, and in moments of the highest spiritual excitement no longer knew whether he was in the body or not, who once at any rate thought himself to have been snatched up into the third heaven and into Paradise, is not the man whose avowed *perception* can vouch to us for the objective truth of a fact so entirely incredible in itself, and so contradictory to all other existing experiences.

Now the only 'point d'appui,' as Sabatier reminds us, for all this, is found in the passage, 2 Cor. xii. 1–9, in which Paul undoubtedly speaks of heavenly visions and revelations vouchsafed to him from time to time.[1] But the Apostle's statement

the scientific inquirer into the reality of miracles by Renan in the introduction to his *Vie de Jésus*. With Paret's criticisms we may compare the closely parallel passage in Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 43.

[1] Beyschlag's articles in the *Studien und Kritiken* remind us how much both Baur and Holsten depend upon this passage to establish their argument as to the incompetency of Paul to distinguish between visions and realities. But by a series of illustrations Beyschlag proves that both the Old and New Testament writers made a marked distinction between them; and this distinction, as he proceeds to show, may be very plainly seen in the Acts of the Apostles. In ch. xii. 9, *e.g.*, it is said of Peter, after his release from prison, that he knew not that it was true what was done by the angel, but thought that he saw a vision (v. 9) Whether we regard the narrative as historical or not, it is evident that the writer understood how to distinguish between an actual fact and a vision; moreover, the same book describes visions such as that of Peter in ch. x. 10, and of Paul in the Temple in ch. xxii. 17, as ecstacies, and whilst it designates the later appearances of Christ to the Apostle, and also that vouchsafed to Ananias at the time of Paul's conversion, as visions, ecstacies, ὁράματα, ἐκστάσεις (ch. xviii. 9, xxii. 17, ix. 10), it thrice describes that first appearance, from which Paul's conversion resulted, not as visionary, or estatic, but as an actual fact. How then, asks Beyschlag, can Holsten assert as something self-evident that we have no ground for regarding 'that first vision of the Messiah' as anything different from the manifold 'visions and revelations of the Lord' of which Paul informs us in 2 Cor. xii. 1? It is quite true, as Beyschlag himself admits, that once, in Acts xxvi. 19, Paul himself speaks of the appearance of Christ vouchsafed to him before Damascus as a vision, ὀπτασίᾳ, but the word ὀπτασίᾳ, as Beyschlag shows, is not confined to appearances which the narrators regard as visions (comp. Luke i. 22, xxiv. 23), and its meaning must here be explained from the entire 'objectivity' with which Paul invests the narrative of his conversion; to say with Holsten that Luke has translated 'objectively' the 'subjective' appearance of a light and the 'subjective' sound of a voice is merely a *petitio principii*.

Studien und Kritiken, pp. 203 ff. 1864; and also *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 192–206, 1870.

See further, Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 446, 447, and on the manner in which

in this chapter, so far from relegating his 'seeing' Jesus to the inner world of his own consciousness, helps us to establish a directly opposite view. It is not only that the chronological notice 'fourteen years ago' (verse 2) cannot, without the most violent exegesis, be referred to the moment of the Apostle's conversion. Paul would hardly have spoken of himself at the time of the event as 'a man in Christ'; but the Apostle's whole tone and attitude with respect to the visions and revelations of 2 Cor. xii. is in striking contrast with the manner in which he speaks of seeing the Lord in 1 Cor. ix. and xv.

The opening words of this chapter, 2 Cor. xii., show us the Apostle speaking with evident reluctance and reserve. We are made aware of his intention to communicate a series of visions and revelations (since he speaks of them in the plural, and commences so far back in point of time), and not merely the particular incident recorded in verses 2, 3, 4. But as he proceeds, his reluctance becomes a positive aversion (verse 5); not even the insolence of his adversaries shall tear away the veil which hides the depths of his spiritual life; he will no longer boast or parade himself, lest in doing so he should destroy his relation of equality with his readers (verse 6); he will only put forward the aspect of his life most characterised by weakness, and express his regret that he had already said so much (verse 11). But if it was a principle of the Apostle's mode of action to conceal from the public gaze all that belonged to the life of the spirit hidden in God: if when he glories in a vision such as that narrated in 2 Cor. xii., or makes any mention of it, he becomes 'foolish' (verses 6, 11): then he must have made an inconceivable exception in relation to the seeing Jesus of which he speaks in 1 Cor. ix. and xv., if that also could be referred only to this spiritual province. If it had differed in no respect from 'the visions and revelations' of 2 Cor. xii. 1

Paul expressly separates the 'seeing' Christ, upon which his Apostleship was based, from any visionary appearances, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 208, 1870, where Beyschlag follows the line of argument in the text.

See also Mangold's note, *ubi supra*.

there remains a strange paradox in the fact that St. Paul should have made it his loudest boast, that he should have demanded for it a public recognition, and placed it in the forefront of his preaching of the gospel.[1]

Or if, again, it was of the same nature and kind as the spiritual and apocalyptic appearances of Christ, which continued during the Apostolic age (Rev. i. 10, 12), then it is not too much to affirm that the expression 'last of all' (1 Cor. xv. 8) has no intelligible force or meaning. The only justification for its introduction is to be found in the belief that the Apostle drew a hard and fast line between those appearances of which the series was closed (verse 8), and all subsequent visions and revelations, such, *e.g.*, as that described in 2 Cor. xii. 9: and if we ask the reason of this distinction, it is difficult to say upon what else it depended except upon the Apostle's belief that the appearances of the Risen Saviour had a character of objective reality which could not be assigned to such visions and revelations as those referred to in 2 Cor. xii.[2]

[1] For the preceding argument, see Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 248, 249, and also Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 21, 22. Weiss is in the closest agreement with Paret (to whose article he refers) in drawing out this same argument: *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 626, 627, and *Einleitung*, pp. 114, 116, 2. Aufl. To the same effect, Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 44, 45; and Godet in the Introduction to his Commentary on the *Romans*, p. 18 ('La Conversion de Saul'), 2nd edit.

[2] See Paret, 'Das Zeugniss des Apostels Paulus,' &c., in *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1859, pp. 249, 250, with which compare the remarks of Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 45, 46. After speaking of the form of the expression 'last of all' in 1 Cor. xv. 8 as pointing to the line of demarcation which the Apostle drew between the series of appearances thus closed and the ecstacies and visions of the Apostolic age, he adds: 'D'où vient cette distinction très-nette, sinon du sentiment que les apparitions du Ressuscité avaient un caractère de réalité objective que n'avaient plus les visions spirituelles de l'extase?' (p. 46).

So, too, Weiss, after pointing out the way in which Paul differentiates 1 Cor. xv. 8 from 2 Cor. xii., and from the visions described in the Book of the Revelation, inasmuch as the appearance in 1 Cor. xv. 8 marks the last of a series, concludes: 'Dieselbe muss also durchaus etwas Eigenartiges, sie von sonstigen Christusvisionen Unterscheidendes gehabt haben, und das wird man, wenn man ihre Zusammenstellung mit den Christuserscheinungen der Urapostel in Rechnung zieht, immer am natürlichsten darauf zurückführen, das hier irgend ein sinnenfälliges Erlebniss damit verbunden gewesen ist' (*Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 627). To the same effect Godet, *ubi supra*, p. 17; Gess, *Das Dogma von Christi Person und Werk* (Vorwort), pp. 18, 19; Nösgen, *Geschichte Jesu Christi*, p. 648.

It has, indeed, been contended that in using the words ἔσχατον πάντων, St. Paul only meant to express that the appearance of the Risen Lord vouchsafed to him was 'last' in its relation to the appearances vouchsafed to the first Apostles, and that such an expression does not mark it off from other later visions of Christ, but this contention overlooks the fact that the Apostle does not write ἐσχάτῳ ἐμοί 'to me as the last' but ἔσχατον ἐμοί, *i.e.* 'for the last time (when it occurred at all) to me,' whereby he excludes the recurrence of further appearances of a similar kind.[1]

But if the assumption of a mere vision, as Weiss puts it, is inadequate to explain St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. xv. 8, it is unfair to make a similar assumption with reference to the manifestations of the Risen Lord to the other Apostles, all of which are described by the same word ὤφθη, or to interpret such a word to mean a mere visionary appearance, or a mere subjective process in the Apostles' own minds.[2] The death, the burial, the resurrection of Jesus are in St. Paul's view three facts which stand upon an equal footing as facts appealing to the senses. There is not the smallest ground for supposing that Paul's Corinthian opponents had ever thrown doubts upon the reality of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Himself. On the contrary, we find that Paul argues from it, as from a fact which the Corinthians themselves admitted, and the denial of which, even from their own point of view, could be shown to be an impossibility and an absurdity.[3] And yet, as Paret argues, the more Paul adores and spiritualises Christ (so that he prays to Him, as to one who was every-

[1] Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. i. p. 435, note.

[2] See Beyschlag's articles previously mentioned, and Dr. Milligan's note on the word ὤφθη in his *Lectures on the Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 265. For more recent remarks of Beyschlag in which he expresses himself as still holding the same views against the vision-hypothesis, see his *Leben Jesu*, i. 434 ff. 2. Aufl. 1887. How much Schmiedel is puzzled by the word ὤφθη we can gather from his recent remarks in the *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. erste Abtheilung, ii. Hälfte, pp. 157, 158, 1891.

[3] Paret, *Das Zeugniss des Apostels Paulus*, *ubi supra*, p. 251; and Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, *ubi supra*, p. 21; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 59; Godet, *ubi supra*, pp. 17, 18, 19; Thenius, *Das Evangelium ohne die Evangelien*, pp. 73–76; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 226, 1864.

where present, and calls Him by name 'the Spirit') the more remarkable does it become that he keeps such a decisive hold upon the human personality and the actual corporeity of the exalted Saviour. If the question in debate is the resurrection, the Apostle has before his eyes the *body* of Jesus, a body endowed with incorruption, glory, and power. If we ask what was the exact nature of this spiritual and heavenly body we cannot say, but at least we may suppose that the Apostle would have given some explanation of it to the curious and disputatious Greeks, and the hints which he affords us (1 Cor. xv. 49; Phil. iii. 21) are not to be dismissed as based upon his own mere imagination, but upon the bodily appearance of the Risen Jesus vouchsafed to him and to the other Apostles.[1]

Now a popular mode of thought in our own day entirely overlooks the fact that St. Paul places what we call a miraculous event, such as the Resurrection of our Lord, side by side with His crucifixion: the Resurrection, that is, is treated historically and not ideally.[2] It is contended, *e.g.*, that the

[1] Paret, *Das Zeugniss des Apostels Paulus*, p. 251, and *Paulus und Jesus*, *ubi supra*, p. 21, with which compare especially Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 623; Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 359, 360; Meyer, *Corintherbriefe*, i. 419, where reference is made to Paret's article on Paul's testimony; see further, Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, pp. 109 ff.

[2] No one could have expressed himself more decidedly against this view than Sabatier in his *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 59. After pointing out that Paul has described the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus not as two abstract notions, as if he were merely treating of an ideal Christ, but as two historical concrete facts, he continues: 'C'est bien ici la croix à laquelle a été attaché, il y a quelques années à peine, Jésus de Nazareth; c'est bien le tombeau où son corps a été enseveli et d'où il est sorti triomphant. Fût-il impossible de montrer que Paul n'a pas connu autre chose de la vie historique de Jésus, la manière dont il a recueilli et considéré ces deux grands faits suffirait pour rattacher la conscience de Paul au Christ historique, et empêcher de réduire sa théologie à un pur idéalisme.' Compare Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 108, 109: 'The fact itself (the Resurrection of Christ) was treated historically and not ideally. It was not regarded as the embodiment of a great hope, or as a consequence of some preconceived notion of the Person of Christ. On the contrary, the hope was expressly rested on the fact; and the apostolic view of the nature of Christ is deduced from His rising again.' After quoting 1 Cor. xv. 1–8, 11, as an outline given by Paul of 'the Gospel' by which men 'were saved,' he continues: 'Nothing can be more simply historic. What we call the miraculous facts are placed beside the others without any difference. The Resurrection of the Lord, and His appearances after the Resurrection, are taught as events of the same kind essentially, and to

myth of the Incarnation was the expression of the idea of purity, and that to regard Christmas as embodying that idea is to treat it in a way exactly similar to St. Paul's treatment of Easter. The Resurrection of Christ expressed the idea of 'a death unto sin and a life unto righteousness,' and only through a legend could this idea find its way into the hearts of men. But, in the first place, we may readily admit that the words 'birth' and 'death' and 'resurrection' are often used in the New Testament in a spiritual and figurative sense, although there are surely many passages where such an interpretation of them is forced and arbitrary. And, in the next place, we do well to remember that this 'spiritual' interpretation of the historical facts of the Christian creed is no new danger, and certainly no new discovery. There were men belonging to the various sects of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries who retained more or less the dogmas of the Church, but who, under the pretence of spiritualising them, transformed them into mere symbols of universal religious ideas, and treated the historical element as a mere covering of the reality. But, as Hagenbach has pointed out,[1] in all this there lay an element of truth: the mere historical revelation does not effect our salvation unless the historical events are repeated in us, unless Christ again assumes life and form in mankind, unless the Incarnation accomplished in Him is accomplished again in us, unless we are crucified with Him, unless we rise with Him to newness of life, and have with Him our conversation in heaven: but such was the teaching of the orthodox Church, when it was not stiffened into the dead letter. The result, however, of the complete separation between the historical and the ideal, which won

be received in the same way as His Death and Burial. Together they formed "the Gospel," and in this respect, whether it was "the Three," or St. Paul who preached, the substance of their preaching was the same.'

It is necessary to remark that, with regard to Sabatier, one cannot claim that his views remain what they were in 1881. See an article, 'Die "Umbildung" der Dogmen,' in the *Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, Nov. 28, 1890, on Sabatier's pronouncement on Christian Dogmas before the University of Paris, Nov. 4, 1889; and comp. on Sabatier's position, Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 653, 1890.

[1] Hagenbach, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 472.

favour amongst some of these mediæval sects, was certainly not encouraging: in some cases it issued in Pantheism, in others in lawlessness, in others in neglect of the Sacraments,[1] and even the teaching of a holy mystic like Johann Tauler was not free from expressions which the multitude might easily make a pretext for putting aside both grace and virtue.[2] It is surely not unreasonable to maintain that however high and pure may be the motives of men who are tempted to weaken the historical facts of the Christian creed, such a weakening is liable in the hands of less noble spirits to those same gross perversions which characterised former ages, and which Hagenbach has so vividly portrayed.

But in addition to the difficulties arising from an examination of St. Paul's own language, the advocates of the vision-theory are chargeable with the same inconsistency in the case of St. Paul as in the case of St. Peter, viz. that the faith which the vision, in accordance with the theory, ought to create, is all along presupposed. This is pointed out no less forcibly by Dr. Weiss than by Dr. Milligan,[3] and it is a fatal flaw in the highly-coloured efforts of Renan, Hausrath and Pfleiderer, or in the somewhat similar attempt of Strauss to analyse the psychological conditions which resulted in Paul's conversion.[4]

Certainly it has been alleged that Paul's earlier life was marked by gradual preparations for a sudden change. He had been struggling, it is said, against the unsatisfactoriness of the Pharisaic standpoint. He had been pricked to the heart by

[1] Hagenbach, *Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 472–474. [2] *Ibid.* ii. 500, 501.

[3] 'Damit fällt jede Möglichkeit und jede geschichtliche Berechtigung einer Erklärung seines Christusglaubens aus einer auf rein psychologischen Wege vermittelten Christusvision, *welche immer schon irgendwie den Glauben voraussetzt, welchen sie erzeugt haben soll*' (Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 624). Compare also Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch?* p. 30, and especially Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 46, where reference is made to the excellent articles of Beyschlag in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1864, 1870.

With these articles we may compare Beyschlag's remarks in his *Leben Jesu*, Bd. i. pp. 436–438.

[4] For a good criticism of Renan's *rationale* of Paul's conversion (to which reference is made by Hausrath in his own highly-coloured *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. pp. 63, 64), see Godet, *ubi supra*, pp. 18, 19.

the murder of Stephen; he saw in the Nazarenes a joy and a peace in the presence of a cruel death, which he could not dismiss from his thoughts; his excited imagination made him believe that he beheld the image of Jesus and heard His voice—but what he beheld was only the image of his own fancy; what he heard was only the echo of his own conscience.[1] Such a picture of the Apostle's mental state is drawn in direct opposition to his own statements.

Paul knows nothing of a gradual conversion to the Gospel. In Gal. i. 12–16, if his language has any meaning, it certainly shows that he was quite inaccessible to human influences in this matter: all through his life his conversion is regarded as an event which surprised him in the midst of his fanatical zeal: he represents it as *being apprehended by Christ* (Phil. iii. 12), he has been conquered by main force; if he preaches the Gospel he does so *of necessity*; he describes himself by a term which pointedly indicates the sudden change wrought upon him (1 Cor. xv. 8).[2] If it be argued that Paul for a long time previous to his conversion had been resisting better convictions, and drowning the voice of conscience by more violent persecutions, it can only be said that the essential test by which all such theories must be tried, viz. the Apostle's own language, points in quite an opposite direction. More than once he speaks in words of intense self-accusation (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 13), but there is no acknowledgment that in his zeal against the Christians he was violating his conscience,

[1] Thus Dr. Pfleiderer in his *Hibbert Lectures* (1885), in explaining Paul's conversion, speaks of 'a soul which had been violently agitated, and torn by the most terrible doubts' (p. 43); Strauss, *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, pp. 384, 385; and see Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 624, for a graphic description of these fanciful pictures.

Steinmeyer justly criticises the manner in which Strauss gets over the subject of Paul's conversion: 'So ergab sich für den Paulus eine Ekstase, in welcher ihm Christus in aller seiner Herrlichkeit erschien, ihn auf das Verkehrte und Verderbliche seines Treibens aufmerksam machte *und ihn zum Uebertritt in seinen Dienst berief*' (*L. J.* p. 304), '*and summoned him to pass over into his service*': 'that is all, absolutely all,' adds Steinmeyer, 'which Strauss says to remove the difficulty!' (*Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 147).

[2] See especially Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 39; and Weiss, *Einleitung*, p. 116. 2. Aufl.; Godet, *ubi supra*, p. 16; Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 265, 3. Aufl.; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 243, 1864.

or acting wilfully against his better judgment, and if we accept 1 Tim. i. 13 he has himself anticipated and refuted all such imputations.[1]

If, indeed, the Apostle had been filled with a consuming desire to see Jesus after His Resurrection (as Holsten imagines, and as he is obliged to imagine for the creation of the vision of the Risen One in the Apostle's mind), if, indeed, he lived under a sense of painful anxiety that he might be fighting against God, then it was his first and bounden duty to advance no further upon a path in which each step might perchance prove to be a further act of impiety. A man so eminently conscientious as Paul, who could declare that an act innocent in itself was of sin if done in doubt instead of in faith (Rom. xiv. 23), would rather have laid aside his commission from the Sanhedrin, and would have decided that inward mental struggle, not by fresh deeds of violence, but in quiet and retirement.[2]

Nor is Holsten any more successful in his attempt to reduce the Apostle to a mere weak epileptic with shattered nerves. To say nothing of the fact that the almost incredible catalogue of the Apostle's labours in itself refutes such a supposition (2 Cor. xi.), whilst it helps us at the same time to understand more fully the constant references to his bodily

[1] Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. iii. p. 624, and especially *Einleitung*, p. 116, 2. Aufl. ; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 49, 1870. It is not fair to build a contrary theory on the ambiguous proverb contained in Acts xxvi. 14 (see Professor Massie's article, *ubi supra* ; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 259, 260, 1864), especially when such a theory is put forward by critics who insist upon the differences in detail of the narratives of Paul's conversion in the Acts, and who deal with that book in such an arbitrary manner (see, *e.g.*, Hase's method of treating the words in question, *Kirchengeschichte*, p. 143, 1885).

On the other hand we do not, of course, regard the mind of Paul as being at the time of his conversion a kind of *tabula rasa* (see especially Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 312, 5. Aufl. ; and Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 49). If we believe, *e.g.*, that as Saul of Tarsus he found that the legal righteousness of the Pharisees gave him no rest for his soul, and if he was, so to speak, before his conversion inwardly ready for Christ, it is no more reasonable to conclude that the whole process of his conversion may be accounted for naturally than to affirm that pressing hunger or thirst naturally produce of themselves the food or drink by which they are appeased and satisfied (Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 249-260, 1864 ; and *ibid.* p. 45, 1870).

[2] *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 49, 1870.

weakness, it would indeed be strange that if the 'thorn in the flesh' (2 Cor. xii. 9), by which Holsten would understand a kind of epilepsy, was a condition of receiving the abundance of the revelations, the Apostle should thrice beseech the Lord that it might be taken from him![1]

But supposing that the graphic picture is true, and that Paul on the way to Damascus was already almost a Christian? If so, the vision which followed has to account not only for his *conversion*, but for his *Apostleship*. The two are essentially related in Paul's thought and language, as we have already seen; there was one requisite which raised the office of an Apostle above every other, the requisite expressed by Paul himself in the well-known words 'not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead.' But it is one of the essential mental conditions upon which the visionary theory rests, that visions can only render objective images already formed. We are therefore obliged to suppose that Paul was on the point of becoming not only a *Christian* but an *Apostle*, and that he had conceived the thought within himself of filling the Apostolic office amongst the servants of the Crucified,[2] and

[1] *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 237, 238, 1864. See also Dr. Fairbairn's remarks on Paul's character, *ubi supra*, pp. 347, 348.

[2] Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, p. 144, where he well reminds us in a note, the fact which astonished the early Church was not merely that the persecutor had become a convert, but a *preacher* of the Gospel which once he had destroyed (Gal. i. 23, Acts ix. 20, 21). Comp. also Luthardt, *Die Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen im Kreise seiner Jünger* (*Gesammelte Vorträge*, 1876), pp. 71, 72; and esp. Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, pp. 143–147.

So, too, Luthardt, in an essay entitled *Der Apostel Paulus* contained in the same volume, has pointed out that none of the so-called natural explanations, none of the influences which are supposed to have been at work in the Apostle's mind, are sufficient in themselves to explain the entire transformation of his inner man: 'Durch solche Mittel kommt keine Bekehrung zu Stande. *Und wollte man auch seine Bekehrung so erklären—aber wo bleibt der Apostel? Paulus ist auf diesem Wege nicht bloss ein Christ, er ist ein Apostel Jesu Christ geworden*' (p. 148).

So, too, Godet in maintaining the objectivity of the appearance of the Risen Christ to Paul, adds (*ubi supra*, p. 17): 'Paul lui-même était si fermement convaincu à cet égard, qu'il en appelle sans hésiter, 1 Cor. ix. 1, pour prouver la réalité de son apostolat, au fait qu'il a *vu le Seigneur*, ce qui ne peut s'appliquer dans sa pensée à une simple vision; *car on n'a jamais imaginé qu'une vision suffira pour conférer l'apostolat.*'

the imagination which prompted him to believe in this call and mission. Weizsäcker, indeed, thinks that Paul had no need of a special call to the Apostleship.[1] As he had already been a kind of Apostle among the Jews, there is no difficulty in supposing that he should have felt himself called to fill a similar office in the Church of Jesus Christ. But Weizsäcker's theory, however he may elaborate it, really obliges us to believe that Paul made himself an Apostle, and, more especially, an Apostle to the heathen. Yet we cannot justly suppose that there was anything in Paul's past life to account for his taking upon himself the office of a Christian Apostle.[2]

After stating the vision theory and all that can possibly be said in its favour, Keim adds that, notwithstanding all these arguments, it is by no means his intention to adopt it,[3] and he confesses that for him the Resurrection belongs essentially to faith ;[4] he afterwards speaks of it as the secure faith-fortress of the Resurrection.[5] But he admits that the belief that Jesus lived as Messiah in the bosom of God would never have been generated by feverish Oriental visions : the greatest of men would have passed away and left no trace ; in Galilee his memory would have lingered for a time, but we should have had no religious exaltation, and no St. Paul : the evidence which was wanted was that Jesus was alive, and this evidence was therefore given.[6] But this influence of the glorified Christ from a higher world upon his followers—this telegram from heaven, as Keim calls it[7]—exerted in a special manner and at a special time, is it not in the highest degree supernatural ? And what end is gained by substituting one miracle for another, by maintaining, *e.g.*, that the manifestation of the Risen Lord was *real*, while repudiating the term *objective* ?

[1] *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 78.

[2] See Deck in *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*, pp. 36 ff., x. Jahrgang, 1889, 1. Heft ; and comp. the important remarks of Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 56, 6. Aufl.

[3] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. p. 594.

[4] *Ibid.* p. 601.

[5] *Ibid.* p. 606.

[6] *Ibid.* p. 605. For the high value which Keim attaches to Paul's character and testimony on the subject of the Resurrection of Jesus, see his *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 532, and chap. ii. above.

[7] Keim, *ibid.* p. 605.

Even the corporeal appearance of Jesus, says Keim, may be granted to those who are afraid of losing everything without it.[1] Certainly, it may still be maintained that these concessions by no means guarantee the details of the Resurrection appearances to the first disciples recorded in the Gospel narratives. But if such narratives cannot fairly be derived from Jewish or heathen ideas,[2] why should they be summarily dismissed, because they purport to describe in detail events to which Paul had only occasion to make a brief reference, inasmuch as an earlier account of them is evidently presupposed?[3]

At all events it will remain a notable fact in the history of recent German criticism that Karl Hase, no less than Keim, was impressed at first with the arguments for the vision-theory, but recognised on reflection its utter inadequacy to account for the facts of the case. Hase criticises some of the instances recorded in poetry and legend of the appearances of the dead, of a Thomas à Becket, of a Savonarola, but in a few striking words he differentiates all such cases from those recorded in the Gospels: (1) because they consisted only of spiritual appearances, there being no thought of a resurrection, and (2) because after merely affording a pleasing

[1] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. p. 603.

[2] For the impossibility of deriving the New Testament accounts of the Resurrection from previous Jewish ideas, see above, pp. 366, 367; for the equal impossibility of deriving them from heathen sources, see especially Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 115–117.

It is strange that a writer with Professor Huxley's acuteness cannot see the fundamental difference between the belief in the Resurrection of Christ and the belief in the return of a Nero. And yet he seriously compares the one belief with the other (*Nineteenth Century*, April 1889): it was credited, he tells us, not only by heathens, but by Christians also, that Nero was not dead, but was hidden away somewhere in the East, and that he would speedily come again at the head of a large army to be revenged upon his enemies. That such a belief existed no one disputes; but in the one case, the belief was built upon a denial that death had ever taken place (see Renan's *L'Antechrist*, pp. 317–319, and his account of the origin of the belief in the return of Nero); in the other case, the belief was built upon a death which was witnessed to and gloried in as an historical and undoubted fact.

[3] After speaking of the appearances of the Risen Christ in the Gospels, Weiss adds that it is perfectly arbitrary to say that such appearances belong to the later embellishments of legend because Paul does not relate any details of them (Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. iii. p. 605; and comp. also p. 617).

gratification they passed away without result, whilst the Risen One from Golgotha has transformed the world.[1]

In concluding this chapter, it is well to remind ourselves that this inability of German criticism to render any satisfactory account of our Lord's Resurrection—Hase can only conclude that one thing is certain, viz. the firm belief of the disciples and the Church that Jesus had risen ('Geschichte Jesu,' p. 599 : so, too, Strauss himself, 'Leben Jesu,' p. 289)[2] —may be said to apply also to that other great fact of which we have been treating, the conversion of the Apostle Paul. We cannot too often call to mind that it was no inferior critic, but Baur himself, who in the evening of his life, and to the vexation of his followers, gave up all natural explanations of Paul's conversion, and confessed that he could only see in it a miracle the inner secret of which no logical or psychological analysis could discover.[3]

[1] Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, pp. 595–597. See also the remarks of Mr. Gore in his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 76.

[2] How much more satisfactory is the decision of Weiss, who, after pointing out that the greatest critic of our century, whilst granting the firm belief of the disciples in the Resurrection of Jesus, and that that belief had for them all the reality of an historical fact, gives up all hope of explaining the phenomena, adds : 'historical inquiry cannot remain stationary at such a point ; the history of Christianity cannot begin with an insoluble puzzle' (*Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. p. 596). Comp. the similar remarks of Beyschlag on Baur's position, *Leben Jesu*, i. 452, 453, and see also Fairbairn, *ubi supra*, pp. 337, 338. Harnack wishes to distinguish between the historical question and the question of belief. But in his treatment of what he calls the firm historical points he seems to fall back with Baur upon Gal. i. 15, to the exclusion of Paul's other references to the appearance of the Risen Christ vouchsafed to him, and he dismisses as of a legendary character the mention of the empty grave. That the grave was found empty on the third day, Harnack holds to be *excluded* by Paul's account in 1 Cor. xv., and he apparently endorses Weizsäcker's theory already mentioned of Peter's share in creating the belief in the Resurrection (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. p. 74).

[3] Baur's words are these : 'Wir können in der Bekehrung des Apostels Paulus nur ein Wunder sehen, und keine weder dialektische noch psychologische Analyse kaum das innere Geheimniss des Actes erforschen' (*Kirchengeschichte der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, p. 45).

For a criticism of the views put forward by Renan and Keim to explain the conversion of Paul, see Godet, *ubi supra*, pp. 18, 19. With Renan's conclusion that if the Apostle's conversion was not a miracle in the old traditional meaning of the word, it remains a psychological problem for ever insoluble by us of to-day (*Les Epîtres Pauliniennes*, i. 11) comp. the remarks of Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* pp. 55, 56, 6. Aufl. 1887.

It is a common thing to be told that however Baur's opinions may have been modified by subsequent critics, we owe him a great debt of gratitude, because he has given us such wide and rich views of early Church History.[1] But, however this may be, the truth remains that there are two facts, the Resurrection of Jesus and the conversion of St. Paul, of which neither Baur nor any of his followers have been able to give any satisfying explanation, and yet, these are the two facts upon which the whole history of the Apostolic Age turns.[2]

[1] See, *e.g.*, 'The New Reformation,' in the *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1889.

[2] This is well put by Lichtenberger in his *Histoire des Idées Religieuses en Allemagne*, iii. 111, 2nd edit. (E. T. p. 390) 1888: 'La résurrection de Jésus et la conversion de Saint Paul sont les deux points que ni Baur ni ses disciples ne sont parvenus à expliquer d'une manière satisfaisante. Et c'est sur eux pourtant que pivote toute l'histoire du siècle apostolique. Chose étrange mais significative!'

CHAPTER VIII

THE ASCENSION AND THE RETURN

ST. PAUL not only insists upon the great cardinal fact of the Resurrection of Jesus, but he also bears witness to another fact, which is, at least for every Christian, its fitting and necessary complement: 'He ascended into heaven.' To deny the Ascension, and at the same time to affirm the Resurrection, as Schleiermacher proposed, is an inconsistency which no one has emphasised more pointedly than Strauss,[1] and Keim candidly admits that the reception of Christ into heaven is the unanimous assertion of the New Testament writers.[2] Certainly it may be said that in many of his references Paul assumes, and that he never describes, the Ascension of the Lord (although in the Epistle to the Ephesians the fact is so prominent, and the allusions to it are so distinct, that this Epistle has been called 'the Epistle of the Ascension').

[1] See the remarks of Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 232; and also Strauss's criticism in *Der Christus des Glaubens*, pp. 201–208.

On the close connection between the Resurrection and Ascension, and on the Incarnation as completed by the Ascension, see Dr. Milligan, *Ascension of our Lord*, p. 27, and for references to the latter in the Pauline Epistles, see Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 92, 5. Aufl.; and Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, Bd. ii. pp. 622, 623.

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. pp. 606, 607. Among the passages enumerated by Keim, we find 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rom. viii. 34, x. 6; Rev. iii. 21, xxii. 3; Heb. i. 3, 13, iv. 14, vi. 20, ix. 11, x. 12; John iii. 13, 31, vi. 62; Acts i. 11, ii. 33, vii. 56; Ephes. i. 20, ii. 6, iv. 8–10; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 22, &c. Nösgen, *ubi supra*, pp. 685, 686, maintains that if Ephesians is denied to us, Rom. x. 6 contains an evident allusion to the Ascension, and he refers to 1 Tim. iii. 16 as a proof that Paul was always mindful of the fact, and to 1 Peter iii. 22, that it was known and recognised in the Apostolic age. See also Milligan, *ubi supra*, pp. 11–13. It is often maintained that in such passages as 1 Tim. iii. 16 we have a fragment of some early Christian hymn: on the force of the 'faithful sayings' in the Pastoral Epistles, as, *e.g.*, in 1 Tim. i. 15, see Humphry, *ubi supra*, *in loco*, and also p. 253 above.

It is evident that the fact is present to St. Paul's mind, and that it is assumed even in his earliest Epistle in the New Testament (1 Thess. i. 10): there is undoubtedly one reference to it in the Epistle to the Romans (viii. 34), and probably another, although of a more incidental character, in ch. x. 6;[1] and if it is said that even in the later Epistles which are attributed to Paul the fact is still only assumed (cf. *e.g.* Col. iii. 1; Ephes. i. 20), there is a very distinct allusion to it in Ephes. iv. 8–10, and again in the phrase contained in 1 Tim. iii. 16.[2]

The circumstance that Paul only assumes or alludes to the fact of the Resurrection may help us to understand the attitude of a writer like Paret, who declines to accept the Epistle to the Ephesians or the Pastoral Epistles.

After insisting so earnestly, as we have seen, upon the objective fact of the Resurrection, he is of opinion that it must remain undecided whether Paul taught and narrated a visible Ascension of Christ to heaven. The Apostle knows, indeed, that Christ is at the right hand of God (Rom. viii. 34), and he awaits His return from heaven (1 Thess. i. 10, iv. 16; Phil. iii. 20): evidently, therefore, according to Paul, the passage of Christ into heaven must lie between His Resurrection and His later existence in heaven: but *how* the Apostle represented this we do not know.[3] But it is to be observed that after making these qualifications, Paret draws particular attention to the fact that it must always remain a matter worthy of consideration that the Pauline Luke relates most graphically a visible Ascension.[4] We may remark in

[1] On the application of this passage to the Ascension, rather than to the Incarnation, as is sometimes maintained, see Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 336–338; and comp. Keim's references in previous note.

[2] For the significance of these allusions, see Schmid, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 93, 5. Aufl., and Milligan, *ubi supra*, pp. 7–10.

[3] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 22; so also Huraut, *ubi supra*, p. 22.

[4] Paret, *ibid.* He also points out in this connection that the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was certainly a writing of the Pauline School, not only works out the idea of the Ascension as dogmatically as Paul does that of the Resurrection, but almost appears to presuppose that event as visible to the eyes and happening in space, ch. iv. 14, and other similar passages. See the strictures of Steinmeyer, *Die Auferstehungsgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 223, note, on the view

passing that if the fulness with which the Pauline Luke narrates the Ascension (cf. Acts i.) is a proof that the details of that event could not have been unknown to St. Paul, the same line of argument tends to show that the Apostle could not have been ignorant of the details of the Incarnation, when we remember the fulness with which St. Luke describes that event. But further: if St. Paul gives us no detailed account of the Ascension in his Epistles, it is most important to bear in mind that he is writing to Christians who may fairly be presumed to have been already acquainted with it,'[1] and that his fuller treatment of the Resurrection history was demanded by *practical* difficulties which were not immediately connected, so far as we know, with the Saviour's Ascen-

put forward even by Meyer, that while the *actual fact* of the Ascension is immovably established in the New Testament, *a visible occurrence meeting the senses* belongs to a later tradition. On some of the difficulties raised in detail by Strauss and Schenkel, see Milligan, *ubi supra*, p. 15. Harnack, with an ingenuity worthy of Pfleiderer (see above, p. 87 ff.), evidently sees in such passages as Rom. x. 6, Ephes. iv. 9, 1 Pet. iii. 22, the source of the representation of Christ's Ascension (*Dogmengeschichte*, i. pp. 172, 173).

[1] See Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, pp. 224–226, for an interesting account of the 'strange' silence of the two Evangelists, who were also disciples, Matthew and John, as to the Ascension of the Lord, and Keim's references to New Testament passages in Bd. iii. p. 606, *ubi supra*. See Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 685.

'We make the same remark upon the Ascension of Christ as we before made upon His miraculous conception. In regard to neither is prominence given to the special and actual *fact* in the Apostolic writings; in regard to both such a fact is presupposed in the general conviction of the Apostles, and in the conversion of Christian consciousness' (Neander, *Life of Christ*, E. T. 487).

Beyschlag's comments upon the Ascension cannot be regarded as very satisfactory (*Leben Jesu*, i. 460 ff.), and he apparently forgets his own argument with regard to the references to other important facts in the Pauline Epistles, viz. that they were written to Churches already acquainted with the main facts of the Evangelical tradition (*ubi supra*, i. 62, 67, and articles mentioned above in *Studien und Kritiken*). Thus he maintains that the manner in which Paul joins the appearances of Christ vouchsafed to him to the Easter appearances as a proof of the Resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 7, 8), makes the impression that he knew of no intervening fact, such as a visible Ascension of Jesus after forty days, which separated His Resurrection from His Exaltation; and that in his thoughts, as in those of the earliest Christians, the Resurrection and the Ascension were one, inasmuch as the latter was only an exaltation of Jesus above the limits of an earthly existence to one celestial and divine. At the same time, while Beyschlag lays great stress upon the circumstance that none of our Gospels relate the Ascension, since in his view Luke xxiv. 51, καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, is only a later gloss, it is to be noted that he is yet unable to regard the narrative of the event in Acts i. entirely as a myth.

sion : moreover, whilst the reality of the Ascension is the unanimous assertion of the New Testament writers, no one sees more plainly, or describes in grander terms, the issues and bearings of the fact than the Apostle Paul when occasion demanded.[1]

It will no doubt be urged that the idea of an Ascension of Christ may be easily accounted for by Old Testament precedents, or by a derivation from Pagan sources. If, however, we turn to the Old Testament, it would seem that even the narrative of Elijah's translation to heaven signally fails to account for the narrative of St. Luke, since only one of the particulars which he mentions can be derived from the Old Testament story which, of all others, might be thought the most likely to give rise to the 'myth' of the Ascension.[2]

Keim, who rejects the visible Ascension as one of the latest and most untrustworthy offshoots of the Resurrection myths, with which the modern Christian consciousness is mature enough to dispense, cannot help being impressed with the narrative in St. Luke, and he admits that all the Old Testament's precedents find in the third Gospel and the Acts their finest, noblest, and worthiest expression.[3] But there was only one thing which could have created such an expression, and that was the truthfulness of the narrative, for what was there in the existing Messianic conceptions which could possibly have afforded a groundwork for a myth on such a subject? The Jews pictured to themselves, not a Messiah who should

[1] The language which even Sabatier uses when describing 'The Epistles of the Captivity,' gives us some idea of this (*L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 211–238). If the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians are rejected, we can at least point to the statements of the Apostle in Philippians ii. 9, iii. 21 ; nor must it be forgotten, as Reuss reminds us in his comments on *Phil.* (*ubi supra*, p. 129), that the doctrine of the lordship of Christ over heaven and earth and the under-world, occurs also in Rom. viii. 34, xiv. 9 ; 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.

[2] Steinmeyer, *ubi supra*, p. 221 and note.

[3] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, Bd. iii. p. 620. He might well express himself thus when he had just referred (p. 618) to the accounts of the events which we receive from other sources. Thus, as Keim himself tells us, the *Acta Pilati* narrate an Ascension from the Galilean hill Malek in the sight of more than five hundred unbelieving Jews, and of the special observation of the actual entrance of Jesus into heaven whilst he was yet in the midst of his last words. So, too, the Gnostics speak of a flying up to heaven, and others of a progress through the three or the seven heavens !

ascend into heaven, but a Messiah who should remain on earth.[1]

Are we, then, to turn to the 'discredited official proofs of heathenism,'[2] to the stories of pagan heroes and emperors deified and immortalised, to account for St. Luke's narrative of the Ascension of Jesus? Take, *e.g.*, the story of Romulus and his ascension to heaven (Livy, i. 16), to say nothing of the doubts which prevailed (doubts to which the historian gives expression) as to the details and the truth of the narrative, and what analogy does it present to the account of the Ascension of Jesus in the record of St. Luke? In the former case the story arose upon heathen soil, the customary birthplace of similar legends;[3] in the latter case, such an origin is a mere assumption. Moreover, there is a fundamental difference between attributing such an exaltation to a Romulus, a king in his lifetime, and in the memory of all his people, and to Jesus of Nazareth, who came unto His own, and whose own received Him not, whose only earthly throne had been a cross of wood. What was there in such a catastrophe as the execution of Jesus by a death, whose only analogy to ourselves is that of the gallows, to suggest even to the wildest imagination the belief that he had been exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on high?[4]

[1] Schmid, *ubi supra*, p. 93, 5. Aufl. Steinmeyer reminds us (*ubi supra*, p. 222) of the extreme improbability that the disciples could have dreamed an occurrence such as that narrated in Acts i. 9, when we remember that these very same men, as Hoffman rightly maintains (*Schriftbew.* iii. 2), even *after* the Resurrection, do not seem to have entertained a thought of their Lord leaving the world and going to the Father (Acts i. 6).

[2] Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 619.

[3] So Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 610. Hase thinks that both Jewish and Grecian elements were probably at work in the production of the Ascension myth. But it is to be remembered that Hase himself only rejects the *visible* Ascension, and not the spiritual return of Jesus to the Father—but he has to confess that his history ends in vagueness and uncertainty.

[4] No one has spoken more strongly than Keim of the *disastrous* death of the Messiah, and no one has more strongly emphasised the proof that the belief in the Messiah would have died out without the living Jesus (*ubi supra*, iii. 605, 413). Comp. Weiss, *Leben Jesu*, ii. 588.

The remarks of Canon Scott Holland may be quoted in this connection, *On Behalf of Belief*, p. 17: 'Such dim hopes, faintly lingering around the grave of some King Arthur, or some Frederick Barbarossa, or even round the grave of

'From thence He shall come to judge both the quick and the dead.' The same great chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (ch. xv.) is alone sufficient to show that this belief was present to the Apostle's mind, and that it occupied a prominent place in his public teaching; he speaks of the coming of Christ (verses 23–28)[1] in a way which evidently presupposes the familiarity of his readers with the expectation of such an event. In the opening chapter of this same Epistle, Christians are described as 'waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who would also confirm them unto the end, that they might be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ' (ch. i. 8), and Paul himself looks forward to the manifestation of all men before the judgment seat of Christ, and to the day when God should judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to his gospel (2 Cor. v. 10; Rom. xiv. 10; Rom. ii. 16).[2]

some hideous nightmare, like the tyranny of Nero, embody and symbolise nothing else but the profound impression which their actual lives had built up, established, until it had become a part of the common material of general human existence. . . . So a cloud of myth may hang loose about the hero's vanishing; but the myth is meaningless and unintelligible, except as a reflex of the impressiveness and solidity and importance of the real life lived. It witnesses to that and to nothing else. Strip it away, and the life remains, real, comprehensible, valid. But what fragment of parallel is there here to the Gospel? With our Lord it is not the *life* which makes the supernatural myth intelligible, but it is the supernatural act which alone makes the life intelligible. . . . The essence of the Resurrection is that it is not the end, but the beginning. That which, in other stories, is the last flash of the dying sun, is here the first streak of the coming dawn. The activity of the Lord is in reserve, it is withheld, until the Resurrection is past.'

[1] The word παρουσία, lit. 'presence,' which is so frequently used in the Epistles of the second Advent of Christ, is also found several times in St. Matthew's account of the last great Discourse on the Mount of Olives, but not elsewhere in the Gospels (Humphry's *Commentary on R. V.* p. 53).

[2] Whatever may be the exact form of the expression, 'according to my gospel' (Rom. ii. 16), it is quite arbitrary to find in it a proof of the distinction drawn by Paul between his gospel and that preached by the other Apostles, for he speaks in Rom. i. 9. of the 'gospel of his Son,' and in Rom. xvi. 25 of 'my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ.'

In each place where it is used it seems to be connected in the Apostle's mind, as here, with the great facts of the Christian creed. It has sometimes been thought that the expression in Rom. ii. 16 ought to be closely connected with the words 'by Jesus Christ,' as if the Apostle meant to emphasise the fact that the judgment of the secrets of men's hearts will be accomplished, not by God, but by the Messiah Jesus (see, *e.g.*, Lipsius, *in loco*, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.*

In using such language (whatever may be the precise meaning of the term 'according to my gospel') the Apostle shows that he was as familiar as the Evangelists or the Twelve with the thought of Christ as the future Judge of the world.[1]

But it is when we turn to the two Epistles to the Thessalonians that we find the most frequent references to the

1891). But although this announcement of the Messiah as the future Judge would differentiate the Apostle's preaching from Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, it would at the same time be in entire harmony with the declarations of the other Apostles and with those of Jesus Himself. Godet connects the expression with the words 'shall judge the secrets of men,' and thinks that the Apostle is here contrasting the spiritual character of the judgment which he proclaimed with the external righteousness and superficial judgments of Pharisaism. It is at all events very probable that in speaking of 'my gospel,' the Apostle meant to distinguish his own teaching from that of opposing Judaisers, and to emphasise his avowal of the claims of Jesus as his Master, and his recognition of the teaching of the Spirit of Christ, by which the facts of the life and death and resurrection of Jesus had become to him the power of God unto salvation, Mangold, *ubi supra*, p. 477, note.

Comp. Lechler, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 485; Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 62; Gifford, 'Commentary on the Romans,' in *Speaker's Commentary*, iii. 76, 81, 237; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, i. 286, 287. On the use of the expression made of this passage by Steck, see above, chap. iii. p. 193.

Amongst recent commentators, both Reuss (*Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 168) and P. Ewald (*Das Hauptproblem*, p. 144) reject the view that Rom. ii. 16 and similar expressions refer to a written Gospel.

[1] On the remarkable fact that in Jewish writings God Himself, and not the Messiah, is always represented as the Judge, see Professor Stanton's *The Jewish and the Christian Messiah*, pp. 61, 140, 291–293. It is therefore most significant that the attribution to Jesus of the office of Judge is so emphasised in the Pauline Epistles as a part of the common faith of the early Christians, and that this office is always connected with His Messiahship: 'what makes it the more remarkable is that support was not sought even in prophecy for attributing to Him this tremendous new prerogative. At least no citation from the Old Testament was distinctly made in connection with it. We know of no origin which it could have had save the declarations of Jesus Himself' (p. 291). Comp. also the recent remarks of P. Ewald in his *Der 'geschichtliche Christus' und die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 24, 1892.

For the significance of this claim of Jesus to be the future Judge of Mankind—which Baur, Strauss, Weizsäcker, Keim, all acknowledge that He made—see Gess, *Christi Person und Werk*, pp. 241 ff., erste Abtheilung, 2. Aufl.

With Professor Stanton's remarks we may compare those of Mr. Deane in *Pseudepigrapha* (T. and T. Clark, 1891), p. 92, where, in speaking of the eschatology of *The Book of Enoch*, he says: 'The final judge is not Messiah, but God Himself, who shall descend from heaven to pass the sentence upon men and angels.' This view is common to all the apocalyptic literature of the period,

coming of Christ, as might indeed be expected, if we consider the circumstances under which they were written, and the restlessness and idleness which prevailed in the Church of Thessalonica through the belief in the nearness of the Advent. In the first Epistle (to which, as we have seen, the most extreme criticism permits us to refer) St. Paul uses words and expressions which not only show the intensity of his own conviction, but his acquaintance with the exact phrases and colouring of the Gospels. 'What is our hope, our joy, our crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?' (1 Thess. ii. 19)—it is the thought of presenting his converts to Christ which fills the Apostle with hope and pride and joy; it becomes his earnest prayer that 'the Lord might establish their hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, with all His Saints' (1 Thess. iii. 13). And here the Greek seems almost to indicate that these 'saints' are to be assessors in the judgment (*μετά*), and the words may therefore be compared with the thought contained in 1 Cor. vi. 3, and the expressions in the Gospels which may possibly be connected with it.[1]

But the connection with the Gospels, and with the last solemn discourses of our Lord on the Mount of Olives, becomes unmistakable when the Apostle proclaims, in the very words of Christ, that 'the day of the Lord[2] so cometh as a thief in the night' (1 Thess. v. 2; Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39), where the season of distress which precedes that coming

so that our Lord's statement, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath given all judgment unto the Son" (John v. 22), was a novel idea to His hearers, even to those of them who had learned some portion of the truth concerning Christ's nature and attributes.'

Comp. also pp. 189, 229; and Edersheim, *Warburtonian Lectures*, pp. 347, 348.

[1] See Ellicott's *Commentary* (Cassell), iii. 137, *in loco* (comp. Luke xxii. 30), and i. 346. On 1 Cor. vi. 3 see above, p. 311.

[2] On the peculiar force of the expression *the day of the Lord*, see above, p. 266; comp. Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 93.

Even Weiss admits the connection between the Epistles and the Gospels in the imagery of verse 2 (*Einleitung*, pp. 24, 171); so, also, Renan, *Les Évangiles*, p. 78; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 55.

is likened to the travail pangs of a woman (1 Thess. v. 3; Matt. xxiv. 8, 9, St. Mark xiii. 8),[1] when that reiterated and most merciful warning of the Saviour to watch and be sober is heard again (1 Thess. v. 6, Luke xxi. 34–36). For St. Paul, like the Baptist, has to tell of a wrath to come (1 Thess. i. 10, Matt. iii. 7),[2] like his Lord he knows how successive generations of His people were filling up the measure of iniquity (1 Thess. ii. 16, Matt. xxiii. 32),[3] how when men cried peace

[1] The Greek word ὠδίν, which is used in each of these passages, means the pangs of child-birth, and therefore in the two places in the Gospels the Revisers have substituted 'travail' for 'sorrows' (A. V.). 'The great pain and peril, of which the word is a symbol, gives rise to many allusions and comparisons in the Old Testament, and if we assume, as we well may, that our Lord here gives a higher significance to the word and to the thought connected with it, we better account for the frequent recurrence and development of the same figure of speech in the Epistles. The "regeneration," or new birth of the world, of which He speaks is to be accomplished through pain and travail, "the whole creation groaning and travailing together until now" (Rom. viii. 22).' Humphry's *Commentary on the R. V.* p. 53.

It will be noticed that in Luke xxi. 35, the expression is *as a snare* (ὡς παγίς), whilst in 1 Thess. v. 3, we find *as travail* (ὥσπερ ἡ ὠδίν). It is upon this difference that Professor Marshall lays stress in his important article, 'Did Paul use a Semitic Gospel?' (*Expositor* [4th series], July 1890, pp. 74, 75). The Hebrew word for 'snare' and 'travail' is identical so far as the consonants are concerned, which of course were all that was written in the days of early Christian literature. Admit then, argues the Professor, that both Luke and Paul possessed some evangelic fragment written in Hebrew; or, he adds, if this is asking too much, admit that both were acquainted with an oral tradition in Hebrew or in Palestinian Aramaic—and the difficulty disappears; the original fragment written by one who heard the Saviour speak, was, let it be assumed, in the language of Palestine, and that it contained the word חבל, which *might* mean *either* 'as a snare' *or* 'as travail.' St. Luke translated it in the former way, and St. Paul in the latter. But it will be observed that the Professor decides in favour of Paul's translation, because it *more accurately conveys the thought of the Saviour* expressed both in Matt. xxiv. 8 and Mark xiii. 8: ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων, 'these things are the beginning of the birth-pangs'; this thought would have been easily intelligible to the disciples, who were already familiar with the popular expressions, 'the birth-pangs of the Messiah,' or 'the birth-pangs of the æon.' Whilst, then, Professor Marshall's theory *may* explain the discrepancy in St. Luke, his exegesis of the passage certainly confirms our belief in St. Paul's familiar acquaintance with one very important and significant word in our Lord's last discourses.

[2] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 93: 'L'apôtre des Gentils, comme les autres, a commencé par prêcher l'imminence du jugement de Dieu, et décrire, comme Jean-Baptiste, "la colère à venir"' (ὀργὴν ἐρχομένην, 1 Thess. i. 10).

[3] Sabatier, *ibid.* p. 99: 'Il faut que les péchés réunis des enfants et des pères comblent la mesure (Matt. xxiii. 32, 1 Thess. ii. 16). C'est là ce qu'enseignait Jésus, ce qu'enseignaient ses disciples.' Comp. Ellicott's *Commentary*,

and safety a sudden destruction was coming upon them unawares (1 Thess. v. 3, Luke xxi. 34),[1] and their fancied security would be broken by the sound of the trump of God, as the angels went forth to gather together the elect (1 Thess. iv. 16, Matt. xxiv. 31 ; comp. 1 Cor. xv. 52).[2]

The extreme similarity of these passages to the Gospels, especially the opening verses of 1 Thess. v. to St. Luke xxi. 34, inclined Bishop Wordsworth to the view that the Thessalonians had before them the Gospel of St. Luke, while Mr. Lewin, struck with the marks of close similarity, argued that they were in possession of the Gospel of St. Matthew. Mr. Lewin remarks that 'The Apostle says "yourselves know" (ch. v. 2), for he had placed in their hands the Gospel of St. Matthew, in which the warning was contained. The first eleven verses of this fifth chapter suppose the reader to have before him St. Matt. xxiv. from verse 36 to the end.'[3] More recent criticism cannot affirm such conclusions,[4] but they at least testify to the force of the resemblance, a resemblance

iii. 134 ; and especially Ewald, *Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, p. 42 ; and also *Die drei ersten Evangelien*, i. 62, 63, 2. Aufl. 1871.

[1] On the close similarity of language—for example, in the use of the word *αἰφνίδιος*, which is only found in the New Testament in these two places—see Ellicott's *Commentary*, i. 346, and iii. 142 ; Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, p. 324 ; comp. also Holtzmann's parallel between Luke xxi. 24, *ἄχρι πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ ἐθνῶν*, and Paul's phrase in Rom. xi. 25, *ἄχρις οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ* ; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, ii. 405, 2nd edit. 1890.

[2] Meyer, *Commentar*, 'Matthäus,' p. 466, 7. Aufl.; and especially Salmon, *Introduction to the N. T.* p. 459. 'Taking the very lowest view of the authenticity of the Gospels, it still seems to me unreasonable to doubt that the 24th Matthew and the parallel chapters of the other Gospels record in substance a real discourse of our Lord. The description (Matt. xxiv. 30, 31) of our Lord coming in the clouds of heaven, and sending His angels with "a great sound of a trumpet," seems to me to have prompted both St. Paul's phrase, "the last trumpet" in 1 Cor. xv. 52, and the description in 1 Thess. iv. of our Lord descending with the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God.'

[3] *Life of St. Paul*, i. 308. M. Renan, after quoting 1 Thess. v. 1 ff. and 2 Thess. ii. 1–11, adds : 'On voit que, dans ces textes écrits vingt ans après la mort de Jésus, un seul élément essentiel a été ajouté au tableau du jour du Seigneur tel que Jésus le concevait ; c'est le rôle d'un *antichrist*' (*Saint Paul*, p. 252 ; see also p. 250, 12th edit. 1888).

[4] See, *e.g.*, Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 164, 6. Aufl.; and Mangold's note in Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 477, 4. Aufl. 1886.

which H. Ewald has emphasised in the well-known passage of his 'Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus,'[1] where he maintains that the Apostle's words could only have been understood, if his readers had before them a primitive written Gospel. Paret discusses Ewald's view at length, and although he is not prepared to endorse it, he has tabulated the many points of close similarity between 1 Thess. and St. Matthew's Gospel, and he accounts for the likeness on the ground that Paul had gained by tradition a knowledge of many of the historical sayings and discourses of Jesus.[2]

Undoubtedly the most difficult passage in this connection is 1 Thess. iv. 15–18. If we adopt the view that the general imagery and teaching of the passage is derived from Matt. xxiv. 30, 31,[3] we have still to face the difficulty presented by

[1] P. 48.

[2] Paret in his *Paulus und Jesus*, *ubi supra*, p. 55, draws out the comparisons in detail. The passages to which he refers are 1 Thess. v. 1, Matt. xxiv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 2, Matt. xxiv. 36, 43; comp. Rev. iii. 3, xvi. 15. The imagery of the thief in the night he considers as derived beyond doubt from Jesus, and not from the Old Testament (1 Thess. v. 3, Matt. xxiv. 37–39; 1 Thess. v. 6, Matt. xxiv. 42, xxv. 13).

In addition to the authorities mentioned in the preceding notes, it is important to remember that Hausrath connects this same imagery of the thief in the night, 1 Thess. v. 2, with Matt. xxiv. 36; the trumpet in 1 Thess. iv. 16 with Matt. xxiv. 31; the coming in the clouds, 1 Thess. iv. 17, with Matt. xxiv. 30 (*Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. p. 70). Ewald, on p. 48 of his *Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus*, notes not only the connection of the thief in the night with St. Matthew's imagery, but also the reference to the pangs of childbirth and to the duty of watchfulness (1 Thess. v. 1–6, Matt. xxiv. 19 42, 43).

In this connection we may add that Dr. Edersheim (*Warburtonian Lectures*, pp. 347, 348), speaking of the fourth Book of Esdras (our apocryphal second book), dating after the destruction of Jerusalem at the end of the first century, says that if ch. xiii. 27–50 is carefully examined, it will be seen how deeply tinged is the prophetic description which it contains with the teaching of the Gospels, and the words of our Lord concerning 'the last things'—although not as He put it, but in a Judaic form. In fact, he adds, it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the writer had been acquainted with the discourse about 'the last things,' and the inference to which this leads as to the date of the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke need scarcely be indicated. Dr. Edersheim compares also ch. v. 1–3 and ch. vi. 18–28 of this same Book of Esdras.

For the interesting parallel between the last chapter of the *Didaché* and 1 Thess. iv. 13–17, see Zöckler in *Kurzgefasster Commentar*, iii. 28, *in loco*.

[3] See quotation from Salmon's *Introduction* in previous note. Comp. Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 24 and 171, where he connects in both places this

the Apostle's emphatic declaration: *This we say unto you by the word of the Lord* (verse 15). The question at once arises whether the Apostle refers only to historical sayings of Jesus as his source of information, as, *e.g.*, in 1 Cor. vii. and ix.; or whether he is referring to some further source of information —to some special revelation; or whether again (a most improbable supposition) we are to conjecture that we have here a mere subjective view of the Apostle corresponding to the γνώμη in 1 Cor. vii. 25, 40. Certainly it would be strange that a mere personal view of the Apostle should be put forward so solemnly and so emphatically as a 'word of the Lord,' even if we allow that such an expression in itself decides nothing.[1] But amongst the canonical sayings of Jesus there is not one which can be said to correspond exactly with the representation of verse 17, although it would seem that we have intimations of the actual subject which Paul is discussing in some of the words of Jesus in our Gospels (*e.g.*, Matt. xxiv. 30; Luke xiv. 14);[2] nor is it unreasonable, in Paret's judgment, to suppose that the vision of the future may have been communicated by our Lord in still more vividly figurative language than in the short Apocalypses (as the same writer calls them) of Matt. xxiv. and the parallel passages.

passage in 1 Thess. iv. 15 with Matt. xxiv. 31, and points out that if at the return of the Lord all His elect should be gathered together about Him (Matt. xxiv. 31), those already dead cannot be excluded, but must rather have been first raised up (1 Thess. iv. 15, 16). See also p. 171, and Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. erste Abtheilung, p. 22, 1. Hälfte, as against Steck's view that the words in 1 Thess. are taken from 4 Esdras, and that therefore the Epistle is spurious (*Jahrbücher für protest. Theol.* p. 516, 1883).

In this connection we may again refer to the remarks of Mr. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 87, 88 (T. and T. Clark, 1891): 'The tribulations of the last days as delineated in Matt. xxiv. are not unlike the predictions in Enoch lxxx.; but no one reading the two would gather that they were borrowed one from the other, the variations being numerous and actual identity not appearing anywhere.'

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 53, 56. It is used, *e.g.*, to signify the Gospel in a general way, as in 1 Thess. i. 8; it can be applied to some particular decision of the historical Christ, as in 1 Cor. vii. 12; or to a saying of the spiritual and glorified Christ, as in 2 Cor. xii. 9 (p. 53).

[2] On Wendt's view of 1 Thess. iv. 15, see *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 345, and chap. ii. 103 ff. above.

But on account of the uniqueness of verse 17, so far as the New Testament is concerned, and since the point of view in verses 15, 17 is manifestly that of the time of the writer, Paret inclines to the opinion that many of the particular features introduced in this passage are derived from apocalyptic visions of Paul, in which, absorbed in contemplation of the anticipated coming of Christ, the Apostle already felt himself caught up to meet Him in the air, and he reminds us that the same word ἁρπάζεσθαι (verse 17) is found in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4.[1]

In this connection Paret mentions the view held by Gess ('Die Lehre von der Person Christi,' pp. 69 f.), and many other commentators, that all which Paul here speaks 'by the word of the Lord' is to be regarded as actual sayings of the ascended Jesus, to which the same objectivity attaches as to the utterances of the sermon on the Mount which fell from the lips of Jesus while living on earth. But this view is rejected by Paret, not only because it involves the supposition that the glorified Christ related to the Apostle the history of the future, just as it is also supposed that He had related the history of the past—*e.g.*, the institution of the Lord's Supper, and His appearances to the disciples in their order—but because it quite ignores the difficulty of the expression 'we which are alive,' for which Gess (p. 70) substitutes 'those who are still living.'[2] Paret's own judgment on the passage is summed up as follows: if these disclosures of the Apostle as to the fate of the dead and the living at the accomplishment of the kingdom of God by the glorified re-appearing Lord can be described as spoken ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου, and are to be introduced as a ground of Christian consolation, then, above all things, in the first place a more Christian element must lie at the foundation than that contained in common

[1] Beyschlag rightly reminds us that there is no evidence whatever for the modern criticism which would declare the words of Jesus in such passages as Matt. xxiv. 29 spurious, and refer them to 'a small Apocalypse' of a Jewish or Jewish-Christian type, worked up into our Matt. xxiv., Mark xiii. As Beyschlag remarks, there is no evidence of the existence of any such 'small Apocalypse' (*Leben Jesu*, i. 364; Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 498, 2. Aufl.).

[2] *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 57, 58.

Jewish representations of the period, which could only have been superficially Christianised by the insertion of the name Lord or Jesus ; in the second place, they must contain a more objective element than could be derived from the mere ecstatic and apocalyptic revelations of Paul himself. Paul must at any rate be certain that no historical sayings of Jesus describe the events here in question in a deviating or contradictory manner, and further, that his teaching in this passage was similar to that of the other Apostles, or at least not opposed to it. For what confusion would exist, if here something was reckoned as 'a word of the Lord,' whilst there, at a place distant a few days' journey, the direct opposite of it were taught! With regard to the question of circumcision, Paret admits that James apparently taught the opposite of Paul, but he adds that that was a practical matter, on which Jesus had given no decisive utterance, and with regard to which it might be open to discussion what view was more correctly a deduction from the general conception of the life, work, suffering, and teaching of the Saviour. But the teaching as to the return of Jesus had, when Paul wrote, all the importance of one of the most weighty articles of the Christian religion. Beyond this general result as to the sources of this passage in 1 Thess. iv., Paret concludes that we cannot proceed, and it is impossible for us, he thinks, to separate in detail the features of it which may be derived from some popular Jewish Apocalypse, or from a Pauline Apocalypse, or from an historical saying of Jesus.[1]

But whilst we recognise the serious importance of any matter relating to the *παρουσία* of the Lord, may not the key to the introduction of the representation in verse 17 be found in the fact that St. Paul here, as elsewhere in his letters, is meeting an immediate and pressing difficulty in the most direct and practical way? The joy with which the Christians of Thessalonica anticipated the speedy appearing of Christ's kingdom on earth was mingled with hopeless sorrow as to the fate of their departed brethren: and this hopelessness of sorrow, which made the grave as dark for the

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 59 and note.

Christian as for the Jew, was working its ill effects upon the daily life of the Christian community.[1]

But their sorrow was turned into joy when St. Paul could assure the mourners that their dead friends should not be left behind, or without lot and portion in the glories of Christ's kingdom, but that the dead in Christ, being first raised, should come with Him, and share with their brethren in meeting their Lord, and in the blessedness of an eternal union. If, however, the Apostle could thus authoritatively introduce the exact words of comfort suitable to this particular case, it seems unreasonable to affirm decisively that there was no reference in his mind to some sayings of the Lord Jesus in the expression ἐν λόγῳ Κυρίου, unless we are prepared to maintain that we possess all the information which Jesus had vouchsafed with reference to His coming. But such an assertion is obviously beyond our power, when we recollect that our Gospels contain so little of all that Jesus said or did, and that we have no record of His discourses with His disciples during the forty days before His Ascension.

On the other hand, if we consider the restless and unquiet state of the Thessalonian Church, and the deep need of some words of comfort to lighten the darkness of the grave, and to answer a question which, so far as we know, had not arisen in the Saviour's lifetime, we may see why a special assurance might have been granted to the Apostle, just as a message of hope and strength had been vouchsafed to him in his own hour of need and suffering (2 Cor. xii.).

If, however, we cannot determine the exact source of St. Paul's message of consolation to the sorrowing Thessalonians, may we not see in the expression 'we which are alive' (verse 15) a reference in thought to an emphatic declaration of the Lord, and an acquaintance with such sayings as are recorded in each of the first three Gospels, not only in the great eschatological discourses, but in the earlier chapters (cf. Matt. xvi. 27, 28; Mark viii. 32 and ix. 1; Luke ix. 26, 27)? In each of these passages Christ associates the presence of the angels with the manner of His coming, and that coming

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 158.

is spoken of as taking place in the existing generation. The attitude of St. Paul in these Epistles to the Thessalonians is that of a man who had this solemn prophecy ever in mind, whilst he also knows that the exact day and hour of Christ's coming was hidden in the counsels of the Father.

Nor must it be forgotten, in this connection, that in 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52 a very similar phrase is found (together with the mention of the sound of the trumpet, verse 52); and this fact alone ought to make us hesitate before we conclude that St. Paul's views upon the subject of Christ's coming underwent such a rapid change as many writers have affirmed. Thus Sabatier, while he carefully guards himself against affirming any *contradiction* in the Apostle's views of the future, seems hardly justified in maintaining that his earlier ideas were entirely transformed, and freed from the bonds of a traditional Judaism, and the narrow limits of a Pharisaic eschatology in the short period between the two Epistles to the Corinthians—a period which must at all events have been very considerably shorter than that which elapsed between 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians.[1] No doubt change of circumstance might well alter the current of the Apostle's thoughts: when death came so near (2 Cor. 1), and bodily suffering pressed upon Him so heavily, and when his life was one constant round of anxiety and care, it might well be that his gaze was fixed, not upon the Saviour descending in triumph on the clouds of heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, but upon Him crucified in weakness, yet living by the power of God the Father, and imparting the strength of His life to His suffering and dying followers: it might well be that the gloom of Sheol is dispersed, and that in its place there rises the Christian hope of immediate reunion with the Lord (2 Cor. v. 1–11).[2] But when we speak of the Apostle's emancipation at this period of his life from the narrowing influences of a Jewish Apocalypse, we cannot forget that our Lord had expressed Himself in similar terms, and that the seriousness of this fact cannot

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 101, 156, 157, 294.
[2] *Ibid.* p. 157.

be lessened by drawing a hard and fast line of distinction between the teaching of the Apostle and that of his Master.[1] In the nature of the case a letter would be likely to contain allusions, but not more than allusions, to a series of prophecies which there is every reason to believe must have been impressed at a very early period upon the mind of the Christian Church. On the other hand, the fact that the coming of the Son of Man was realised at least primarily in the destruction of Jerusalem, as all schools of Christian thought admit, should surely prevent us from sacrificing the spirit to the letter, from explaining our Lord's prophecies arbitrarily, and from forgetting that they are capable of many interpretations and will yet receive many fulfilments.

There is, in conclusion, one most important point of view from which we may consider the confident expectation of Christ's return which, as we have been well reminded, next to the fact of His Resurrection, is the topic most frequently insisted upon in the Apostolic writings. If it can be reasonably maintained that there was nothing in current Jewish views of the Messiah's office to create this expectation, and if it can be reasonably shown (see last chapter) that there is no parallel between the return of a Nero, and the belief in Christ's coming again from heaven, it is well to remember that just as little basis for such a belief is to be found in the fact that nations have often looked for the restoration of some hero king to fulfil their hopes of a triumphant future. In each case where such an expectation has arisen—just as in the belief that Nero would return with his avenging host—the expectation *has been based upon the denial of death.* But

[1] For the manner in which Sabatier expresses and supports this view, see *ubi supra*, p. 98. Sabatier indeed admits that our Lord actually expressed Himself in Jewish Apocalyptic terms, but he adds that in this imagery as used by our Lord : 'Il y a dans les prédictions de Jésus je ne sais quel spiritualisme intérieur, qui leur donne une grande élasticité et transforme ces peintures en symboles.' But he adds : 'Dans l'enseignement apostolique, ces données, au contraire, se roidissent et s'épaississent ; elles s'organisent dans un cadre rigide.'

If, as Keim fully admits, there is no reason to doubt that Jesus spoke the solemn words before the high priest recorded in Matt. xxvi. 64 ; Mark xiv. 62 ; Luke xxii. 69 (*Geschichte Jesu*, iii. 335 and note), it is difficult to see why He should not have expressed Himself in the imagery employed in Matt. xxiv.

St. Paul can exclaim, 'It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even now at the right hand of God' (Rom. viii. 34)—the death, the resurrection, the ascension of the Lord, each was equally a fact, each was equally an article of the creed of St. Paul and his fellow Apostles: and if we ask for an explanation of this fundamental difference between those stories which grow up around some great national hero and the testimony of the Gospels and the Epistles, between the persistent denial of death on the one hand and its persistent glorification on the other, it is to be found in the fact that between the crucifixion of the Saviour and the belief in His return, there lay the glory of His Resurrection: in the presence of that fact the hope of the Christians was based not upon the uncertainty or the denial of the death of 'another King, one Jesus,' but upon its reality.[1]

[1] See Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, pp. 128 ff.; Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, p. 345; Row, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 363; Milligan, *Our Lord's Ascension*, p. 10.

CHAPTER IX

ST. PAUL AS AN 'EVANGELIST'[1]

THERE are important questions which the previous chapters will doubtless raise in many minds: why, it will be asked, is St. Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus apparently so meagre, and his references to the Saviour's life and teaching so few? Was the Apostle's knowledge *mediate* or *immediate*, *i.e.* was it derived from tradition or revelation? and how far did other sources of information influence his mind? Some earlier considerations will have suggested the probability that St. Paul was much more intimately acquainted with the facts of the Gospel history than might at first sight appear to be the case.

But without again insisting upon the unlikelihood that a man who had shown such a close acquaintance with the Saviour's last moments should have absolutely ignored the other events in His life,[2] let us look once more at the proposition which contains the sum and substance of the Apostolic preaching, *Jesus is the Christ*. It might seem at first sight as if this brief but all important declaration would divert the Apostle's mind from the consideration of the *human* surroundings of Jesus, and lead him to seek in the Old Testament for types and prophecies of the Messiah. But, from another point of view, this diligent inquiry into the Jewish Scriptures rather tends to prove the surety and firmness of the historical knowledge of Jesus which Paul possessed: for

[1] The Apostle to whom we owe the preservation of the saying 'It is more blessed to give than to receive,' has thereby become to us truly an 'Evangelist' (Stanley's *Corinthians*, p. 588).

[2] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 60, 62, 63. Amongst recent English writers, Prof. Carpenter, whilst pointing out that Paul's allusions to the human life of Jesus are indeed but few, admits that much more may have been included in what the Apostle describes in Rom. vi. 17 (*ubi supra*, pp. 64, 65).

only after the knowledge relating to the life of Jesus had assumed a concrete form, and had become, as it were, a fixed quantity, could he have felt induced to seek out prophecies and prototypes and even preludes in the Scriptures of that which had occurred afterwards.[1] To reverse the argument, and to maintain that the details of the life of Jesus were shaped in accordance with prophecies of the Messiah,[2] is to lose sight of a previous question, Why was this particular Jesus (out of so many Jews who bore the name)[3] fixed upon as the Messiah, unless the circumstances of His life rendered Him specially suitable?

Nor can we argue from the frequency of St. Paul's quotations from the Old Testament that he was only scantily acquainted with sayings of Jesus which he could substitute for them.

To judge from all the traces, the first Apostles, who must undoubtedly have been fully acquainted with the sayings of Jesus, adopted the same method as Paul in their teaching (which is to be distinguished from the preaching of the Gospel in the stricter sense); so that, in reality, we have here only one of those points of contact between them and Paul, in which he takes his stand upon the same ground and retains the same method.[4]

It may seem strange that in this respect the Apostle who so freely opposes the permanent obligation of the law should act in the same manner as the older Apostles 'of the circumcision' (Gal. ii. 9). But, as Paret reminds us, this circumstance becomes less surprising, when we remember that scarcely anywhere in the Pauline Churches could communities be found composed exclusively of Gentile Christians. Judaism had its colonists everywhere before Christianity appeared: it exercised a mighty charm upon the population of the Roman empire in days which witnessed the breaking-

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 28.

[2] Comp., *e.g.*, Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 35, or Holtzmann, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* i. 17; and Baur's expression (quoted by Paret), in which, with reference to Paul, he speaks of 'die Gebundenheit seines Bewusstseyns an das Alte Testament.'

[3] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 9, 10, and note. [4] *Ibid.* pp. 20 and 40.

up of all religions: there was scarcely anywhere a town in which a number of proselytes of the gate was not to be found amongst whom the Old Testament was in use, and from whom the Pauline Churches must have been largely recruited.[1] It will also be noticed that these quotations are found for the most part in those Epistles in which the Apostle had to enter into explanations with Jews or Judaism: in the Epistle to the Galatians, *e.g.*, we find about ten, in that to the Romans about fifty-two of them, whilst none occur in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon: so, too, such turns of thought as we find in Rom. vii. 1., or Gal. iv. 21 (where there is a decidedly ironical colouring) show that it was often only regard for Jewish opponents, and Jewish objections, which occasioned a dialectical or allegorical excursion into Old Testament territory.[2]

But whilst there is every reason to suppose that Paul valued the confirmation which the Jewish Scriptures gave to his Christian belief, it is quite another thing to affirm with Baur that the Old Testament was for the Apostle the source of all objective truth, the only external support of his religious faith. Sabatier, whose remarks upon Paul's use of the Old Testament are in close harmony with those of Paret, is equally emphatic in condemning Baur's conclusion: he admits the important part which type and allegory played in the Pauline method, but like Paret he denies that the Apostle's convictions were the result of the bold method of interpretation, with which his rabbinical education enabled him to deal at a great advantage over the other Apostles; and whilst it may be said that Paul read the Old Testament with the eyes of a Christian and the penetration of a Rabbi, it must not be forgotten that his exegesis depended much more upon his faith than his faith upon his exegesis.[3]

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 42.

[2] Paret, *ibid.* See also Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. des N. T.* p. 273, 5. Aufl.

[3] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 64–67, 258; comp. also Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 56, 6. Aufl. 1887, where he points out that we are not to see in Paul's appeal to the Scriptures a mere accommodation to the customs and demands of the Jews, but a part of his own theology, which, after

But whether St. Paul knew our Lord during His earthly ministry, and whether he was present in Jerusalem during the closing scenes of His earthly life, or not, or whether he was one of those of Cilicia who disputed with Stephen: there is another point of view from which that same statement *Jesus is the Christ* must have awakened in him the keenest interest, and supplied a basis for definite inquiry. He must at least have known before his conversion that the Christians, whom he so zealously persecuted, proclaimed a crucified malefactor as the Messiah of the Jewish nation—but unless his hatred was a mere blind and senseless zeal,[1] it is difficult to suppose that he would not acquaint himself with the ground upon which the presence of the Christians in the Jewish National Church could no longer be tolerated; for, as Paret reminds us, the Christians stood before his eyes not merely as foolish visionaries, but as dangerous heretics, and he was their persecutor because, as a Pharisee and the son of a Pharisee, he regarded them as opponents of the traditions of the elders and destroyers of the law: his position as one who thus persecuted 'above measure' becomes unintelligible unless as a Pharisee he had gained some accurate information of that side of the teaching of Jesus hostile to Pharisaism, and unless it was clear to him that in the communities which regarded Jesus of Nazareth as their Founder, there was some living agency at work not derived from Judaism.[2]

the veil of literalism had been removed from his eyes, had found in these Scriptures a revelation previously unsuspected.

'The Old Testament text is altogether, and considered as a whole, not the substance from which the thoughts of the Apostle proceed, but only the form and garment in which he clothes his purely Christian and independent thoughts; he reads the Old Testament with Christian eyes, and finds therein only what is Christian' (Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 42, 43).

[1] 'Soll er denn da verfolgt haben, was er noch in keiner Weise kannte?' (Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 22 ff. 1870).

So, too, Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 65: 'So stark auch sein Hass gegen die Christen war: ein blinder Hass ist es gewiss nicht gewesen.' To the same effect Lindemann, *Die Echtheit der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, p. 40, 1889. Even Strauss cannot deny that as their persecutor Saul must have known something of the beliefs of his victims. *Leben Jesu für das deutsche Volk*, i. 368.

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 65, 66; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 6; comp. Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, pp. 31 ff. 1870. See, however, Nösgen, *ubi supra*, p. 22.

But Paul's position *after* he became a Christian is equally unintelligible unless we bear in mind another fact, which indeed can scarcely be pressed too strongly against the criticism which would place an impassable gulf between the teaching of Paul on the one hand, and that of Jesus and the first disciples on the other. There were, no doubt, in his preaching of the gospel some bearings of it which in his character of 'the Apostle of the Gentiles' Paul most strongly emphasised,[1] but in order to be sure of his ground he must have known that no *positive* sayings of Jesus could be quoted against him. If, then, he had no knowledge of the discourses of Jesus, if this whole province in the teaching of his Master had been to him an unknown land, what would have been his position? He could never have been sure but that at any moment he might find himself confronted with some saying of the Lord, vouched for by a James or a Peter, as, *e.g.*, 'unless ye are circumcised, ye cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,' or, 'I will not receive the Gentiles unless they keep the law of Moses.'[2]

But if Paul was at any time opposed in this manner on the authority of an explicit saying of the Lord there is no evidence of it in the New Testament; indeed his recognition by the elder Apostles, Gal. ii. 9, furnishes us with direct proof of the contrary, as also the impression which the Jewish Churches entertained of him: 'he preaches the faith which once he destroyed' (Gal. i. 23)—*i.e.* the same belief which he once sought to exterminate. It would therefore seem that wherever Paul differed from the other Apostles the points at issue could not have been decisively settled by the historical Christ in favour of either side.[3] Certainly there is a Christ who lives and speaks in Paul (Gal. ii. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 3), but there is also a Christ to whose example Paul is conformed, and whose teaching Paul repeats; and there was need of

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 131, 133, 137, and comp. also pp. 186 and 237, 2. Aufl. 1889.

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 34; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 61. Comp. also P. Ewald's argument in proof of Paul's knowledge that his 'universalism was in accordance with the will of Christ (*Das Hauptproblem*, p. 84).

[3] Paret, *ibid.* pp. 34, 35, 60.

the assurance that the Christ within him could not be affirming one thing and an external Christ another. Without this security his whole Apostolic work was endangered, unless we make the inconceivable supposition that the Apostle was prepared to place himself above Christ, and to proclaim himself as a kind of Montanist Paraclete. But the whole attitude of Paul is clearly that of a man who is sure of his ground, and that confidence was his because he was quite familiar with the historical teaching of the historical Christ.[1]

But we are justified in believing that there was a further reason which would cause Paul to refrain from multiplying quotations even from the teaching of Jesus—a reason suggested by his own previous training and controversial knowledge. There is undoubted evidence that he was well acquainted with the methods of Rabbinical argument, and that on occasion he had recourse to such methods after he became a Christian:[2] but it is equally certain that his Christian point of view was in direct contrast and opposition to the Rabbinical wisdom and instruction of the time. To make the teaching of Christ a mere collection of texts, a mere external law, to reduce it to a mere lifeless and mechanical thing, to heap together piecemeal sentences from revered teachers, from this Rabbi or from that—this, as Paret argues, would have constituted for the Apostle a true service of death, a service in the letter. Nothing could have been further removed, not only from the example of Jesus of Nazareth, who taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes, but also from the belief of the Apostle that the Christ in him was a life-giving quickening Spirit.[3]

No doubt it will be urged that the arguments to which we have just referred are of *negative* rather than of *positive*

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 35, 36.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 28, 303; Weizsäcker, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, p. 114; Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. 37.

See also the interesting remarks of Dr. Edersheim in his *Sketches of Jewish Social Life*, p. 187.

[3] Paret, *ibid.* p. 69; Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 60.

Compare P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 140: 'Nichts hat Jesu ferner gelegen als die Weise der jüdischen Rabbinen.'

value in establishing St. Paul's knowledge of the historical life and teaching of our Lord. But we have seen occasion to believe that the Apostle was much more fully acquainted with the historical Christ than has often been supposed to be the case, and we ground that belief not merely upon his elementary preaching, which presupposes such an acquaintance, but upon the fact that he is able to solve some pressing difficulty, or to answer some practical question, by a reference to the words and acts of Jesus. Whence did he derive the knowledge which he is thus prepared to apply so practically and so decisively? With regard to our Lord's *words*, and the important place which they occupied in Paul's thoughts and teaching, nothing could be more emphatic than the remarks of Weizsäcker (see above, chapter ii. pp. 63 ff.), in spite of his interpretation of 2 Cor. v. 16, according to which the Apostle attaches no significance to the *events* of the life of Jesus.[1] Certainly Weizsäcker supposes that Paul's quotations of the Lord's words are derived from the 'Spruchsammlungen,'[2] but we may well ask if it is possible to make collections of our Lord's sayings, or of His discourses, quite apart from the events of His life? Do not these discourses often presuppose an historical introduction, and are they not in many cases quite inconceivable apart from some historical framework?[3]

If we seek from St. Paul's own statements for the sources of his knowledge it would seem that they were twofold—tradition, oral or written,[4] and revelation. It is a difficult,

[1] See, *e.g.*, *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 121–123. [2] *Ibid.* p. 386.

[3] See the important remarks of Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 487, 488, and notes, and comp. P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, p. 78.

[4] Reference has already been made to H. Ewald's opinion that Paul was quoting from a written Gospel in 1 Thess. v. (see above, chap. ii., for Ewald's views), and to Professor Marshall's belief that Paul and Luke (comp. 1 Thess. v. 1–8 with Luke xxi. 34–36), were quoting from some original Gospel fragment written in Aramaic, or at least perpetuated by oral tradition.

At the same time Ewald distinctly admits that Paul does not always appeal to a written document. Bleek held that Paul, *even before his conversion*, was not only acquainted with the outward circumstances of the life of Jesus, but also with many of His discourses, partly through oral tradition, partly also through smaller Gospel writings which were early in existence, and especially collections of the sayings of Jesus. But in the latest edition of Bleek's *Einleitung in das*

perhaps a hopeless, task to attempt to assign positively the part due to each, but it is a far more hopeless task to explain St. Paul's Epistles by denying that he had any knowledge of the historical Jesus, since even Pfleiderer admits that without some historical *data* of the personal life of Jesus the work of Paul would be 'a castle in the clouds,'[1] or, as Paret and

N. T. (4. Aufl. 1886), Mangold considers that Paul's acquaintance with any written source is very questionable, although he has no doubt that the Apostle had an intimate knowledge of the life of Jesus by means of oral tradition (note p. 477; Mangold here refers to Paret's article, *Paulus und Jesus*).

The question as to whether Paul used a written document has lately acquired a fresh interest from the learned work of Dr. Resch, in which he advocates the Apostle's acquaintance with a Hebrew *Urevangelium*, while in England Professor Marshall's articles in the *Expositor* have directed attention to the same subject. The latter writer, however, does not deny that *oral* tradition may also have been at work. (For some account of Resch's *Agrapha* and P. Ewald's criticism, see above, ch. ii. pp. 106 ff., where reference will also be found to Professor Marshall's theory.)

But if, as modern criticism asks us to believe, the *Logia* of St. Matthew, and another writing which we may describe as containing Mark's notes from the preaching of St. Peter, are the two documents which formed the groundwork of our first three Gospels, it is not too much to say that St. Paul's Epistles at least carry with them an acquaintance with the contents of such documents, since these Epistles, if they contain few direct references to the sayings of Jesus, assume His teaching and His kingdom as their basis (see chap. v.), and St. Paul's visit to St. Peter, upon the significance of which we have already dwelt, would have put him in possession of much of St. Peter's information, added to which we have the points of contact between Paul and Mark already enlarged upon in ch. v. Amongst English writers Mr. Halcomb has lately advocated the view that all our four Gospels were in existence before the Epistles (*Historic Relation of the Gospels*, pp. 36 ff., 235, 240, 243, 244, 249, 1889); it cannot be said that this view has gained any wide acceptance, but it is certainly remarkable that Hilgenfeld, the foremost living representative of the Tübingen school, is prepared to put the original Matthew back into the fifties (comp. Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 483, 499, 2. Aufl. 1889). Mr. Halcomb's chapter entitled 'The Gospels in the Epistles,' pp. 32–50, is of interest in connection with Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus.

On the whole, while it seems impossible to deny that Paul may have had access to written documents as well, yet his own expressions and the contents of his Epistles are quite compatible with the theory that oral tradition was the source of his knowledge (P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem*, pp. 143 ff.; Westcott, *Study of the Gospels*, pp. 169 ff.), although we need not hold that such a tradition was handed down in one fixed form (Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, p. 344; for P. Ewald and his maintenance of a Johannine as well as a Synoptical tradition, see above, ch. v. pp. 329 ff.). For Neander's advocacy of the view that Paul was acquainted with written memoirs of the life of Christ, see chap. ii. p. 91. It is to be observed that Hausrath admits that Paul may possibly have had access to a *written Gospel* (*Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 69).

[1] *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 10.

Sabatier put it, we should reduce the Apostle to a kind of Swedenborg, mistaking his own thoughts for direct revelations from God.[1] In the union of the two sources there lies the strength of the Apostle's position, and in this he is not removed from, but rather in harmony with, the experience of the first disciples. There is indeed an external Christ, an historical Person, who had lived on earth a human life; and there is also the Christ who dwells in the Apostle, with reference to whom he could speak of a time when it pleased God 'to reveal his Son in me': and yet there are not two, but one Christ.[2]

It is therefore unfortunate that such a passage as Gal. i. 12 should sometimes be interpreted as if it excluded all traditional knowledge of the Christian Founder on the part of St. Paul.[3] Even when he speaks of 'my gospel' it is evident that he includes in the term fundamental and universally-accepted Christian truths (Rom. ii. 16, comp. xvi. 25), however much, as in the case of the Galatians, opponents may force him to lay stress from time to time upon special aspects of his own Christian teaching in relation to the Jewish law or the acceptance of Gentile converts. Nor is there any reason why, as in the case of the older Apostles, who were gradually led into the understanding of the mind of the Lord, and educated into conformity with His will,[4] so, too, St. Paul, even after his conversion, may not have read a special meaning for himself in these words of Christ: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now': it was surely in the desire that Christ might be formed more

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 72; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 53, 77, 78.

[2] Sabatier, *ibid.* pp. 50–64.

[3] For a careful examination of the meaning of this passage in relation to Paul's testimony, see Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 60 ff.; and comp. with his results P. Ewald, *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage*, p. 75; Gess, *Das apostolische Zeugniss*, p. 371, in his *Christi Person und Werk*; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p 56; Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 66; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, Introd. p. 30; Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 119, 2. Aufl.

[4] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 62 and 71, 72, with which comp. the remarks of Roos, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus*, pp. 8, 9.

perfectly in him that we must seek the cause of his retirement to the desert of Arabia.[1]

No doubt there are some very familiar passages in the Apostle's writings in which we must face this difficulty of distinguishing between that which he received from others and that which was specially revealed to him. We have already had occasion to refer to this difficulty in examining 1 Thess. iv. 15, and if we turn to the important passage 1 Cor. xi. 23, the same question again arises—although, whichever way it is decided, whether, *i.e.*, we refer the Apostle's statement to tradition or revelation, the fact remains that at the date of this undoubtedly genuine Epistle St. Paul is acquainted with the significance of the death of Christ and with the details of the institution of the Eucharist.

Certainly the Apostle's mode of expression has naturally excited the closest attention. He does not merely draw a parallel (as in 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3) between his own traditional knowledge and that of his converts—he does not merely say, 'I received that which also I have delivered unto you,' but *παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ* Κυρίου, 'I received *from the Lord*.'

In dealing with these words, it has been sometimes alleged that Meyer has built an argument for an *indirect* as distinguished from a *direct* reception by Paul of the commands and acts of Jesus at the Last Supper upon the one word *ἀπό*.[2] But, in the first place, it should be noticed that Meyer does not deny that the knowledge came to the Apostle by revelation, as he distinctly admits that Paul's expressions preclude the thought that he was merely dependent upon human information. No doubt the middle course which Meyer adopts in introducing the thought of a revelation by the Spirit, or by an angel, is open to criticism;[3] but it is remark-

[1] Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* pp. 116, 117, 2. Aufl. 1889; comp. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 7; Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, i. 154, 155, in the new issue (1890) of the fifth edition.

[2] See Meyer's *Korintherbriefe*, i. 315, 316; and comp. Canon Evans, *in loco*, *Speaker's Commentary*, iii. 324; Alford's *Greek Testament*, ii. 572.

[3] For a criticism of this view put forward by Meyer, see Gess, *Das apostolische Zeugniss*, pp. 356, 357, 1. Hälfte, in his *Christi Person und Werk*; comp. also Paret, *ubi supra*, pp. 51–53.

able that the preposition ἀπό, which is generally used of the more remote source of information, is found here instead of παρά, which the Apostle employs not only in the important passage Gal. i. 12, but in 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1, 2.[1] But if we admit that the words do not point to a special revelation, what do they mean? Is any light thrown upon them by the context? There are passages in 1 Corinthians in which the Apostle is dealing with matters which admitted of discussion and controversy (1 Cor. xi. 16); or, occasions had arisen when he had prescribed directions for divine service upon his own authority (1 Cor. vii. 17)[2]—but here the case is different.

Here he blames with reiterated emphasis the treatment by the Corinthian Christians of a part of God's service which was no ordinance of man, no ecclesiastical festival of man's device, but which was actually the Lord's Supper—*i.e.* a meal instituted by the Lord Himself. It is as if the Apostle would say: 'This Holy Communion is not merely a matter of my arrangement, but it has its origin from the Lord; in this particular you have to deal with a greater than I: for as the Founder He is also the Guardian, to maintain the sanctity of His Institution: He will not allow those who desecrate the memorial of His death, and reduce it to the level of a mere common meal, to go unpunished. And that it is in this

[1] See the important remarks of Bishop Westcott on this employment of ἀπό in 1 Cor. xi. 23, showing that the Apostle received *mediately* (and not directly) from the Lord the account of the institution of the Eucharist (*Study of the Gospels*, p. 180, and also 177, note 2). It must, however, be remembered that in Bishop Lightfoot's opinion the above distinction between ἀπό and παρά cannot be insisted upon (*Galatians*, p. 80). But, on the other hand, the distinction has very recently been endorsed by Schmiedel, *Hand-Commentar zum N. T.* ii. erste Abtheilung, 2. Hälfte, p. 133 (1891), where he remarks that ἀπό as distinguished from παρά (1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; Gal. i. 12) points to an indirect reception, which he prefers to derive, not with Resch (comp. 1 Cor. ii. 9) from an *Urevangelium*, but from oral tradition.

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 38, 52, 56; Weizsäcker, *ubi supra*, pp. 619, 620. If in 1 Cor. xiv. 37 we retain the reading Κυρίου ἐντολαί, it is plain that even here the Apostle does not place his own directions upon a level with the objective word of Christ (see 1 Cor. vii. 10); they become 'commands of the Lord' only in so far as they are recognised to be so by the man who claims to be spiritual (xiv. 37), see Meyer, *Korintherbriefe*, p. 189.

sense "a Supper of the Lord" you have already had to feel (xi. 30)—and indeed, in a very painful way.'[1]

If it is said that, had St. Paul been referring to the general Evangelical tradition, he would have used the plural and not the singular (*παρέλαβον*), it is to be remembered that in 1 Cor. xv. 1 he uses, not the plural but the singular, where he evidently has in mind the main facts of the Apostolic preaching (verse 11); nor is it strange that he should speak with such personal emphasis to a Church where his own authority was in question, and whose members had so flagrantly desecrated the Holy Feast.

If we wish to proceed further, and ask for the exact source of the Apostle's information we can scarcely hope to get beyond the region of conjecture. It may have come to him from one who, like Mnason, had been a disciple 'from the beginning' (Acts xxi. 16), or, from those who were 'in Christ' before him (Rom. xvi. 7)[2]—it may have formed part of that oral tradition which, like other words of the Lord Jesus, had not yet been precisely fixed in all the Churches—he may be solemnly reiterating some liturgical formula of habitual use in 'the breaking of the bread';[3] or he may have had before him some written document, some *Urevangelium*.[4]

[1] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 52, 53; and comp. Gess, *ubi supra*, p. 357: '"Das vom Herrn her" ist beigefügt, weil die Corinther das Abendmahl behandelten, als wäre dessen Stiftung nicht eine hochheilige Stiftung des Herrn selbst, das *ἐγώ*, weil er sich, der diese Herrnstiftung in ganz anderer Weise, als der jetzt eingerissenen, unter ihnen geordnet hat, ihnen, die solche Abirrung erlaubt haben, gegenüberstellt.'

[2] Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 53; *Kurzgefasster Commentar* (Strack and Zöckler), dritte Abtheilung, p. 174. It is of interest and importance to note the force of the word *ἀρχαῖος* as applied to Mnason; it is rendered by the Revisers 'an early disciple,' *i.e.* one who had been a disciple from the beginning, from the great Pentecost (see Humphry on R.V. p. 239).

Comp. also Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 37, and Beyschlag, *Leben Jesu*, i. 66. Dr. Matheson's view of 1 Cor. xi. 23 in his recent *Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 118–121, will also be read with interest.

[3] The view maintained by Godet and Dr. Salmon (see above, p. 352).

[4] See Professor Marshall's discussion of the words of Institution in his article, 'Did Paul use a Semitic Gospel?' in *Expositor* (4th series), July 1890, pp. 77 ff.; comp. also Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 178. For further remarks on this theory of a primitive written document and its employment by St. Paul, see above, chap. ii. pp. 106 ff. It must not be forgotten that Professor Marshall admits the possibility of an Aramaic *oral* tradition.

But whilst we cannot interpret Gal. i. 12 so as to exclude a knowledge of the historical Christ on the part of Paul, we can see how the transforming spirit of the Apostle made itself felt in relation to the simplest historical *data*, so that they are no longer 'dead facts,' but indued with the power of an endless life. To take one instance only. Supposing that Paul, as we have seen every reason to believe, had been informed of the details of the Saviour's Passion; he could not have contented himself in his preaching with a mere recital of facts, or with more or less ingenious references to Old Testament types and prophecies—only a man all aglow, so to speak, with the love of Christ, who could describe himself as crucified with Him (Gal. ii. 20), could stir the hearts of his converts so deeply, and appeal to the self-sacrifice of Jesus as the law of the Christian life (Gal. iv. 14; 2 Cor. v. 14), and inspire so fully and plainly the new spirit of Sonship and boldness towards God (Gal. iv. 5, 6).[1]

But if it is thus necessary to take into account the personality of the Apostle in his presentation of the facts of the life of Jesus, and in the teaching which he bases upon them, it is not sufficient to dwell upon his reasoning and dialectical powers to the entire exclusion of the mystical and spiritual side of his nature.[2] This consideration weighed so powerfully with Weizsäcker that he introduces a whole section on *the Spirit* as one of the chief sources of the Apostle's knowledge, assigning it a place not only in the divine revelation at Damascus but in Paul's subsequent teaching (1 Cor. ii. 10–16), and tracing the working of its influence in the claim to have the mind of Christ and the Spirit of God (1 Cor. vii. 40).[3] It is no doubt easy to dismiss this spiritual element in the Apostle's character, to describe it as morbidness, or to relegate it to the same category as the hallucination of dreams and visions—to ridicule it as a factor which finds no place in human psychology. But has it, then, no place in a character which the keenest

[1] Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 63; comp. Mangold's note in Bleek's *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 477, 4. Aufl.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 68.

[3] *Das apost. Zeitalter*, pp. 116, 117.

criticism acknowledges to be faultless, in a character so harmonious, humanly speaking, as that of Jesus of Nazareth? He, too, we are justly reminded, had his hours of ecstacy, holy seasons which a vulgar profanity might describe as hallucinations (Mark i. 12; Luke x. 18, ix. 29).[1]

But further: this Spirit which was the source of St. Paul's deepest knowledge, the fountain light of all his day, the master light of all his seeing, was clearly in the Apostle's view no mere occasional or ecstatic influence: he manifestly identified it with Christ Himself, '*Now the Lord is the Spirit*' (2 Cor. iii. 17).[2] And thus we are led up to that one mode of the expression of that mystical union with Christ which is characteristic of the writings of St. Paul equally with those of St. John. Let us take, *e.g.*, St. Paul's own account of the divine purpose of God in his conversion, 'to reveal His Son *in me*.' It is here that we meet for the first time with that use of the preposition ἐν which so often recurs in the language of St. Paul, in such formulæ as οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ, ὑμεῖς ἐν Χριστῷ, and the like; its *mystical* use, which runs through the whole Gospel of St. John, and which is already present in germ in the first three Gospels under the figure of the bridegroom, and in various sayings (cf. Matt. xviii. 20, xxviii. 20, x. 40).[3]

This communion between St. Paul and his Lord, if gauged by the language of the New Testament, is altogether something unique, something far transcending the relations which exist between one man and another.[4] A Plato carries on the work and perfects the philosophy of a Socrates; and there is no doubt a sense in which a man may be said to live

[1] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 70.

[2] Sabatier, *ibid.* pp. 260, 311; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, p. 72.

[3] Paret, *ibid.* pp. 72, 73; Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 51; and comp. P. Ewald, *ubi supra*, p. 82, and chap. v. p. 343 above.

On the significance of this figure, used by our Lord, see Maclear, *Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*, p. 113; and Kennedy, *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, p. 63.

For this mystical element in the Pauline teaching, and its great importance, see also Reuss, *Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des N. T.* p. 53, 6. Aufl. 1887.

[4] For this and the following paragraphs, see Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 259, 260; Paret, *Paulus und Jesus*, pp. 71 ff.

again in the lives and the thoughts of others—a master in his disciples—a spiritual father like St. Paul in his spiritual sons, and in the Churches which he had begotten. We may even admit that there are expressions in which St. Paul speaks of the relation between Christ and the Christian to which parallels may be found in the ordinary phrases of human life: 'Thus we say,' writes St. Chrysostom, in commenting on Ephes. iv. 24, 'in the case of friends: such an one has put on such an one.' But here, in its bearing upon human friendship, the expression used is a metaphor, and is evidently recognised as one. When, however, St. Paul employs again and again such expressions as these, 'To me to live is Christ,' 'It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me,' 'Christ in you, the hope of glory,' do not such words express something far beyond a mere metaphor? Do they not point to some spiritual reality, to some present living and abiding union with that Lord who is the Spirit? We may justly speak of reverencing a fellow-man, we may be constrained to offer him our love and homage alike, but neither reverence nor love adequately express the relationship between the Christian and Christ, only one word can express it, *religion*, *i.e.* a living tie which unites the man to a Divine Person.[1] To Him, the Risen Saviour, in St. Paul's language, believers belonged. The Apostle knew Jesus as the living One for him and in him, and therefore he speaks so little in his letters of Him who lived before him (*i.e.* of the historical Jesus).[2] And yet, all the more wonderful is it how his faith is rooted in the historical Christ when we consider how his thoughts are centred on a present living Saviour, and how near that Saviour appeared to him as the Lord also of the future (comp. *e.g.* Phil. iv. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 22).[3] But if by the indwelling Spirit of the Lord St. Paul could speak of himself as 'a new creature,' and declare

[1] See Paret, *ubi supra*, p. 73. Amongst English writers we may compare such expressions as those used by the author of *Ecce Homo*, pp. 156, 157, 301 (small edit.), and with a much deeper and fuller meaning such passages as those contained in Dr. Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 347, 5th edit., and *Some Elements of Religion*, pp. 19-21.

[2] Paret, *ibid.* p. 30.

[3] Paret, *ibid.* pp. 29, 30.

that 'old things had passed away,'[1] if Romans vii. reveals to us something of the struggle which the Apostle had himself realised in his own bitter experience[2]—such a change involved something beyond a mere intellectual acceptance of the Messiahship of Jesus.

It is a favourite position of the Tübingen school that gradual reflection upon the saving significance of the death of the Cross brought Paul to acknowledge that this same Jesus who was crucified is both Lord and Christ, and the extreme representatives of the school are never tired of enforcing the view that to Paul everything else in the life of Jesus was unimportant save the two events of His death and resurrection.[3] But if Old Testament prophecy, or at least current Jewish interpretations of it, did not point to the belief in a suffering Messiah,[4] and if it is altogether a fancy picture to imagine the Apostle transformed from a Pharisee into a Christian by reflecting upon Isaiah liii.,[5] is it possible that any other sources of knowledge can account for this marvellous change of character and life? Supposing, *e.g.*, that St. Paul

[1] Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 77, 78; Godet, *L'Epître aux Romains*, i. Introd. p. 22; Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 241, 1864.

[2] This is the view taken by various writers; comp., *e.g.*, Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 34; Godet, *ubi supra*, ii. 87, 88 ff.

So, too, Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 38; *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 79. See also Hausrath's remarks, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 37.

[3] Beyschlag remarks with much force that from one point of view this was the position of the older Apostles no less than of Paul; they, too, base their authority, not so much upon their long intercourse with Jesus, as upon their brief and transient view of the Christ who died and was risen again. According to Luke xxiv. 46–49 their Apostolic mission consists in testifying to these two facts, the Passion and Resurrection of Christ; in Acts i. 21–22 Peter indeed mentions their former continuous companying with Jesus, but lays stress upon the testimony to His Resurrection; so, too, in 1 Cor. xv. 11 and 15, their personal testimony as eyewitnesses to the facts of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus forms the essential element in the preaching of the older Apostles also (*Studien und Kritiken*, p. 225, 1864).

[4] See chap. i. p. 23, and chap. vi. pp. 360 ff.; comp. Beyschlag, *Studien und Kritiken*, p. 19, 1870: 'Für den Pharisäer und Schriftgelehrten fiel dagegen entscheidend ins Gewicht, dass weder Schrift noch Tradition etwas von einem stellvertretend leidenden und sterbenden Messias wussten, vielmehr eine solche Idee mit der orthodoxen Messiasvorstellung sich im schneidendsten Widerspruch befand.'

[5] Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. p. 59.

did not give up his Jewish theology when he became a Christian, and that we take into account the fact that a question of frequent discussion in the Rabbinical Schools was how a man could be righteous before God—supposing even that a prophetic passage like that in Isaiah liii. was referred to the Messiah[1]—still we are compelled to ask why did Paul attach such a tremendous significance to the death of Jesus of Nazareth? That the Apostle, with his profound sense of sin, and with his rigid Pharisaism,[2] should conceive of the life and death of Jesus as that of the Jewish Messiah, and of a perfectly righteous man whose sufferings had power with God and made atonement for the defects of his fellow-men, would at least lead us to infer that Paul had gained something beyond a mere superficial knowledge of the Jesus to whose life and death he attached such an importance. How much more so, when we are required to believe that all this by no means exhausts St. Paul's conception, and that the death of Jesus, the heavenly and spiritual man, the representative Head of the whole human race, has an atoning power for Gentile and Jew alike, that it was a divine act of atonement for the whole world, since the world was represented in the death of its Head, a way opened out to Jew and Gentile by which the imputed righteousness of Christ might compensate for the righteousness unobtainable by the law.[3]

Certainly to account for some of the elements in these Pauline conceptions, we are asked to look far beyond the limits of the Rabbinical Schools, and the influence of Hellenism

[1] See, *e.g.*, the picture drawn by Hausrath among others, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Bd. iii. pp. 58 ff., and 97; and see especially in answer, Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 116, 2. Aufl. 1889; and Beyschlag, *ubi supra*, where, with reference to the idea of an atoning human sacrifice and its connection with Isaiah's prophecy, he adds this important note: 'Ein einziges Mal tritt dieselbe im Alten Testament hervor, Jes. liii. 10; aber es ist bekannt, wie weit entfernt das Judentum zur Zeit Jesu davon war, diese Stelle dogmatisch und messianisch zu deuten. Und selbst der nachmalige Apostel Paulus hat sich auf diese Stelle nirgends ausdrücklich berufen, zum Zeugniss dafür, dass dieselbe ihm nicht die Bedeutung eines Zeitsterns zur Erkenntniss des Kreuzes Christi gehabt hatte.'

[2] See Hausrath, *ubi supra*, pp. 37, 38, 81, 82.

[3] See the review of Pfleiderer's 'Urchristenthum,' in *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*, x. Jahrgang, 1889, 1. Heft, pp. 9–12.

is freely invoked to explain the workings of the Apostle's mind. There is, indeed, nothing strange in the fact that the Pauline Epistles should contain some allegorical interpretations,[1] and when we remember that it was the object of St. Paul to present the Gospel to the great Hellenic world, no less than to that of his own countrymen, it is not surprising to read that his Epistles 'contain almost as many allusions to Hellenism as to Rabbinism.'[2] But it is quite a different thing to maintain that the fundamental conceptions of St. Paul's theology were derived from Hellenic sources, a position which is the direct reverse of the truth ;[3] his deep sense and horror of sin, *e.g.*, certainly did not come to him from Hellenism. Pfleiderer, the great advocate of these Hellenistic influences, admits that Paul shows no acquaintance whatever with the works of Philo (a most important concession), and although he depends a great deal upon the alleged acquaintance of the

[1] Dr. Edersheim, speaking of the connection between Greek thought and the Bible, remarks that Plato and the Stoic school had busied themselves in finding a deeper *allegorical* meaning, especially in the writings of Homer, and that this allegorical method was the welcome key by which the Hellenists sought to unlock the hidden treasury of Scripture (*Jesus the Messiah*, i. 33, 34). He adds in a note (p. 34) that he cannot discover any traces of the existence of allegorical interpretations in the Synoptic Gospels, or of any connection with Hellenism such as Hartmann, Siegfried, and Loesner (*Obs. ad N. T. e Phil. Alex.*) put into them ; similarity of expressions, or even of thought, afford no evidence of inward connection. But he points out that in the Pauline Epistles some allegorical interpretations are found, as might be expected, and that as they occur chiefly in the Epistles to the Corinthians they are perhaps owing to the connection of that Church with Apollos.

Comp. Hausrath, *ubi supra*, pp. 23 ff.; Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, pp. 154–158.

[2] Edersheim, *ibid.* p. 55.

[3] How entirely the fundamental conceptions of the Pauline theology were rooted in the Old Testament, and how directly they were opposed to the current systems of philosophy, has been well pointed out by Godet (see for his remarks chap. iii. p. 241 above). Comp. also Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 29–32, 48 ; Weiss, *Einleitung in das N. T.* p. 120 and note 2, 2. Aufl. 1889; Gloël, *Die jüngste Kritik des Galaterbriefes*, pp. 76–78. No one has protested more strongly than Schenkel against the derivation of Paul's theology from the Philonian teaching of the Logos, or from the formularies of the Alexandrian School (*Das Christusbild*, pp. 299, 300). Hausrath, who finds so many fanciful points of connection between Hellenism and St. Paul's teaching, admits that, so far as he Apostle's anthropology is concerned, his thoughts are rather derived from Jewish than from Grecian sources, whilst with Philo the opposite is the case (*Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, iii. 84, note). See also the strictures of Harnack upon the 'Hellenism' of Paul, *ubi supra*, p. 45 note, 83, 84, and note.

Apostle with the Book of Wisdom,[1] yet it is to be observed that this book contains nothing from which the idea of the atoning efficacy of the death of Jesus could be derived.[2]

The truth is that even if we limit the Apostle's knowledge of the historical Christ to the two events of His death and resurrection, we are still face to face, not only with 'Jesus Christ the righteous,' but with a life-giving Personality which neither Hellenism nor Judaism can explain, with a new relationship between God and man, which could only be realised by those who were personally united to Jesus by faith, by the mystical union preached alike by St. Paul and St. John.[3]

It will be noticed that before he introduces his hero, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, Pfleiderer speaks of the exceeding might and power of that social revolution which was destined to transform and renew the face of the earth, which had its origin among those simple Jews who had not yet separated from their fellow-countrymen, and which made its way, not in a spirit of violence and self-seeking, but by self-sacrificing ministering love—which found its ideal in Jesus, the Friend of the heavy laden and the poor, and recognised in Him the sure pledge of victory. But whilst such considerations alone point to a more than human power in Christianity, a power which was not created by the wisdom and skill of Paul, any picture of the early Christian Church which would reduce the religion of Christ to the level of a mere Jewish sect entirely fails to do justice to one fact (upon which an earlier chapter insisted)—*the offence of the Cross had not ceased.* If, indeed, the Christian community had been undistinguishable from a sect like that of the Pharisees, if there was no new principle in the Gospel differentiating it from Judaism,

[1] Speaking of Philo as Paul's contemporary and the most important representative of the Alexandrine-Jewish theology, Pfleiderer writes: 'Dass Paulus mit dessen Schriften bekannt gewesen sei, ist nicht nachzuweisen und kaum wahrscheinlich; auch würden ihn, wenn er sie je gekannt hätte, die specifisch philosophischen Speculationen Philos ohne Zweifel eher abgestossen als angezogen haben' (*Urchristenthum*, p. 158).

[2] *Expositor*, vol. vii. pp. 367–371, 3rd series.

[3] See for Pfleiderer's acknowledgment of this 'mystical' element in Paul, *Urchristenthum*, p. 241; and *Theologische Studien aus Württemberg*, *ubi supra*, p. 12.

why should Saul of Tarsus have passed from one to the other?[1] That new motive principle was, in a word, the preaching and the power of the Cross. The scene on Calvary was in reality the irretrievable break between the old religion and the new; henceforth between Judaism and Christianity there stood the Cross,[2] although the disciples did not at first perceive all that the Cross involved, and did not foresee its far-reaching universal power: that was grasped in the first place by St. Paul. But we shall not understand St. Paul's teaching if we regard it as a mere theological system apart from the man; God did not choose a Gentile to become the Apostle of the Gentiles—He chose a Pharisee.[3] The universalism of St. Paul has its root, not in his Hellenism, but rather in the fact that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, and if he had been less a Jew his work would probably have been marked by less boldness and less freedom. But because he was a Jew he had known only too well the utter vanity of mere external ceremonies, and the crushing yoke of the law, its condemnatory power, its strength, its terror; because he was a Jew, he could say, under the deepest sense of the burden of sin, 'Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?' and in the thankfulness which followed upon so great a deliverance, why should he become a transgressor by building again the things which he had destroyed? 'God forbid that I should glory save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ.'[4]

The words were true of each portion of the Apostle's Christian life;[5] whatever was the development of his thoughts,

[1] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, pp. 6, 10.

[2] Sabatier, *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 12: 'La rupture irrémédiable entre la religion du passé et celle de l'avenir avait eu lieu au Calvaire. Jésus, en mourant, a garanti son œuvre contre toute réaction inintelligente ou timide. Dès le commencement, entre elle et le judaïsme, il a planté sa croix, et, quand les disciples seront tentés de rebrousser chemin, ils la rencontreront toujours entre eux et leur peuple comme une infranchissable barrière. C'est la croix, en effet, qui est le vrai principe moteur de tous les développements qui ont suivi.'

[3] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, p. 49. See also a remarkable passage to the same effect in the fourth edition of Neander's *Geschichte der Pflanzung*, revised by the author, and incorporated in the fifth edition, i. 118.

[4] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 48, 49.

[5] See for this, Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 12, 54, 79, 85, 86, 215–220, 232, 277, 313, 314.

whatever the animosities he had to face, or the questions he was called upon to decide, the Cross remained the central point of his theology, a revelation of the depth of the love of God and of the sin of man, a revelation of life in the midst of death. In the highest conception of the Pauline theology, in the Paulinism *des derniers temps* (as it is called), no less than in that of the earliest missionary labours, it is in the Cross that the Apostle sees the great historical fact of the world's redemption; and as he extends his gaze beyond the outward form of this world, which was ever passing away, it is by the blood of the Cross that he beholds all things reconciled unto Christ, the Firstborn from the dead, whether they be things on earth, or things in heaven—the circumference is enlarged, the central point is still the same.[1]

There is, then, a sense in which it is most true to say that from its commencement to its close Paul's whole Christian life depended upon the death and resurrection of Christ, and in his theology, as in his own soul, those two facts claimed and held the foremost place.[2]

Near the city of Rome there stands at this day a church dedicated to the memory of St. Paul: over what is said to be his tomb, his own words find a fitting place—*Vas Electionis*; below it runs the legend which sums up in one brief sentence all his answer to the puzzling riddle of human existence: *Mihi vivere Christus est, et mori lucrum.* When he writes to the Corinthians that henceforth he will not know Christ after the flesh, we need not suppose that he undervalued the human life of Jesus; he could still love to think of the Christ who died—but he adds, 'yea rather, who is risen again'; he was still 'crucified with Christ'—but he adds, 'nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' He felt within himself the beatings of the pulse of a Risen Life, and while, in one sense, 'former things'—the memories of the earthly life of Jesus—never 'passed away,' yet they had most surely 'become new.'

'I remember,' says Bishop Ewing, 'one night sitting with Père Hyacinthe in Rome, in the midst of his troubles,

[1] Sabatier, *ubi supra*, pp. 215, 216. [2] *Ibid.* pp. 53–55.

at a time when there seemed to him an end of all perfection, and his heart failed and flesh fainted. But when one said: "*Mihi vivere Christus est*," he exclaimed, "Yes, that is enough, that is all."'[1] It is the simple testimony of the great multitude whom no man can number, who, through all the changes and chances of this mortal life have had the witness in themselves, the witness borne by the Spirit and the Presence of Jesus Christ, 'the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.'

'Christ is the end, for Christ was the beginning;
Christ the beginning, for the end is Christ.'

[1] Quoted by Dr. Story in *Creed and Conduct*.

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES QUOTED

Arnold, M.: on the Incarnation, p. 278

Bauer: his arguments against the *Hauptbriefe* reproduced by Steck and Völter, pp. 133, 202, 214; his attempt to disprove the historical reality of Jesus, 139; his invidious tone and reckless criticism condemned by Steck, 140; his embittered career, and his failure, *ibid.*; his negative conclusions advocated by Loman, 144, 145; remarks of Weiss upon, 157; Bauer's theory of the dependence of the Pauline writings upon Seneca, revived by Steck, 214

Baur: on 2 Cor. v. 16, p. 2; criticism on his rejection of Rom. xv. xvi., 5; on Philemon, 8, 9; dates assigned to the Gospels, 12; influence on Strauss, 18; object in minimising Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 27, 28; on Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 28; Paret's criticism, *ibid.*; on 1 Cor. vii. 25, 63 and 319; Zahn's criticism of, 134 ff.; Baur's position reversed by Steck, 157; his remarks on the *Hauptbriefe*, 243; his view of 1 Cor. viii. 6 and Phil. ii. 6, 260; on Rom. ix. 5, 281; on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 292; on the Resurrection of Jesus, 378; on Gal. i. 15, 379; on ἔκτρωμα, 381; on 2 Cor. xii. 9, 383; on Paul's conversion, 395; Lichtenberger's criticism, 396; Paul and the Old Testament, 416; claim of Jesus to be the future Judge of mankind, 403

Beyschlag: on Paul's acquaintance with Jesus, p. 2; on the value of the Pauline Epistles, 19; references in them to the human life of Jesus, 93 ff.; on the institution of the Lord's Supper, 97, 99; on the pre-existence of Christ, 270; on the Incarnation, 289; on the Passion, 350; reference to his criticism of Strauss's account of the last hours of Jesus, 355; date of the Hebrews, 356; on its references to the human life of Jesus, 357; the burial of Jesus, 363; the Old Testament and the Resurrection of Jesus, 365; on John xi. 24, 366; on Paul's list of appearances of the Risen Christ, 369, 373; reference to his criticism of the word ὤφθη, 370 and 386; on the appearance to the five hundred, 374; agreement between Paul and the Twelve, 377; the truthfulness of the accounts of Paul's conversion, *ibid.*; criticism of Baur's account of the Resurrection of Jesus, and of Gal. i. 15, 378, 379; importance of inference from 1 Cor. xii. 28, 380; explanation of Paul's 'reserve,' 381; Paul distinguishes between visions and realities, 383; on the force of the words 'last of all' in 1 Cor. xv. 8, 386; further objections to the vision-theory, 389; on Paul's mental state at his conversion, 390, 391; on the Ascension, 399; no evidence of any 'Small Apocalypse,' 409; Paul's knowledge of Christianity before his conversion, 418; Paul and the older Apostles, 430; doctrine of a suffering Messiah foreign to Jewish tradition and interpretations, 430, 431

Birks: on Rom. xv. 17–19, and Paul's claim to miraculous powers, p. 303 ; on 1 Thess. ii. 14, 15, 350 ; on 1 Cor. v. 7 as a note of time, 351
Bousset: his criticism of Resch, pp. 129–131 ; on the Words of Institution, 352
Carpenter: on 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, p. 266 ; on the miraculous birth of Plato, 279 ; reference to the birth stories of the Buddha, 281 ; on points of connection between Mark and Paul, 315 ; on Mark xv. 21, and Rom. xvi. 13, 358 ; Paul's knowledge of the human life of Jesus, 415
Christlieb: on 1 Cor. xv. p. 365
Dalman: on the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah, pp. 23 and 360, 361
Darwin: his loss of faith, and the Gospel records, p. 1
Dawson: on the Incarnation, p. 281
Deane: on the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah, p. 361 ; significance of Jesus regarded as the future Judge, 403 ; Matt. xxiv. and Jewish Apocalyptic literature, 408
Deck: his criticism of Weizsäcker on 1 Cor. xv. 3–8, pp. 371, 393
Derry, Bishop of: on the word Κύριος in relation to Jesus Christ, p. 263 ; on the word *Abba*, 313 ; on 1 Cor. x. 27 and Luke x. 8, 322 ; on 1 Cor. vii. 35 and Luke x. 40, 326 ; on Mark xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13, 358 ; on 2 Tim. i. 12, *ibid.*
De Wette: on Ephesians and Colossians, pp. 9, 256 ; Steck's criticism of his view on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 292 ; on the Hebrews, 356
Didon: on the Incarnation, pp. 274, 279, 281, 287 ; on Matt. xxviii. 16, 373
Dorner: on the Adam Kadmon, p. 273 ; on the title 'Son of Man,' 282
Drummond, J.: the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah and Jewish expectations, 361
Edersheim: Jewish ideas, and the Christ of the Gospels, pp. 22, 23 ; Pfleiderer on the value of Edersheim's work, 22 *note* ; on the accuracy of St. Luke, 245, 246 ; on the title 'Son of David,' 253 ; Paul's Christology and Philo, 259 ; on Old Testament prophecy and the narratives of the Incarnation, 277 ; on Jewish views of marriage, 279 ; on the lineage of the Virgin and Joseph, 289 ; the Resurrection of Jesus, as it took place, quite foreign to Jewish ideas, 366 ; force of the word ἱστορῆσαι in Gal. i. 18, 372 ; Jesus as the future Judge of mankind, 403 ; St. Matthew and St. Luke and 4 Esdras, 407 ; Paul's Epistles and Hellenism, 432 ; Paul's Epistles and Rabbinism, *ibid.*
Evans: on the force of ἀπό in 1 Cor. xi. 23, p. 424
Ewald, H.: his judgment on the Pauline Epistles, p. 7 ; on the Risen Jesus, *ibid.* ; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 34 ff. ; agreement between Paul and the Twelve, 158 and 377 ; on Ephesians, 256 ; the character of Jesus in the Gospels and Epistles, 294, 295 ; reference to the Temptation of Jesus, 297 ; reference to the Gospel miracles in James ii. 19, 302 ; the Epistles and the teaching of Jesus, 311, 314 ; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and the command of the Lord, 319 ; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321 ; further connections between the Gospels and Epistles, 324, 325 ; date of the Hebrews, 356 ; on 1 Cor. xv. 3, 367 ; 1 Thess. v. and the Gospels, 407, 421
Ewald, P.: refers to Paret's treatise, p. 86 ; criticism of Resch's *Agrapha*, 106 ff. ; Paul's acquaintance with the life and teaching of Jesus, 113, 114, 318–321 ; on Rom. vi. 3, 115 ; on 1 Cor. ii. 9, 116 ; on Col. iii. 18, 121 ; on the force of ἴδιος in Rom. viii. 32, 255 ; connection between Paul and John, 329 ff. ; his criticism of Roos, 330 ; on 1 Tim. vi. 13, 351 ; on Col. i. 20, 359 ; reference to the appearance to James, 373 ; to the five hundred, 376 ; on Rom. ii. 16, 403 ; Jesus as the future Judge, *ibid.* ; Rabbinism and

the teaching of Jesus, 420; the discourses of Jesus and their historical framework, 421; the sources of Paul's knowledge, 422

Fairbairn: criticism of the mythical theory, p. 20; Jewish ideas and the Christ of the Gospels, 23; reference to the silence of Josephus as to Jesus, 152; on the title 'Son of Man,' 282; on the beauty of St. Luke's narrative of the Incarnation, 290; on Judaism and 'the Suffering Messiah,' 361; the Resurrection of Jesus, as it took place, quite foreign to Jewish ideas, 366; on Paul's character, 392; criticism of Baur on the Resurrection of Jesus, 396; significance of the belief in the return of Jesus, 414

Farrar, A. S.: on the distinction between myth and legend, p. 17; on Bruno Bauer, 140

Farrar, F. W.: on the title 'Son of Man,' p. 287; on the use of the word ἐκκλησία, 309; on words and phrases common to Luke and Paul, 327

Fisher: on the force of 2 Cor. xii. 12, p. 302

Footman: refers to the evidential value of Paul's Epistles, p. 25

Friedrich, J. (Maehliss): his recent attack on the Epistle to the Galatians, p. 134; on the same lines as Steck, *ibid.*

Gess: the monotheism of the Jews, and the language of the disciples of Jesus, pp. 262, 276; on the force of the word Κύριος, 264; on 'the Son of Man' and 'the second Adam,' 282; on omission of former in the Epistles, 287; on the Kingdom of God in Gospels and Epistles, 309, 310; on the Resurrection appearances, 370, 376

Gibson: on 2 Tim. iv. 18, p. 313; on 1 Tim. vi. 13, 314; points of connection between Paul and Luke, 326

Gloël: on 1 and 2 Thessalonians, p. 4; on Steck's attitude towards Acts and Galatians, 158; on van Manen, 160; recognition of Gloël's work, 161; on Steck's historical difficulties, 160–176, 176–179; on Steck's view of the dependence of Galatians upon Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, 164 ff.; arguments from external testimony against Steck's position, 179 ff.; on Steck's account of the Words of Institution, 200; of the Resurrection of Jesus, 203–207; on Steck's theory of the dependence of the *Hauptbriefe* on extra-canonical writings, 211 ff.; his defence of Galatians as against Völter, 225, 237; on Hilgenfeld's rejection of Steck's hypothesis, 239; on the force of 1 Cor. i. 2, 264; on 1 Cor. x. 27, 322; the change wrought in Paul by his conversion, 430

Godet: on Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, p. 2; on Rom. xv. xvi., 6; on the Pauline Epistles, 25; on the Words of Institution, 199; on the date of the Romans as against Völter, 224; on Paul's visits to Jerusalem, 231, 232; refutation of Steck, 240 ff.; criticism on Keim's position with regard to the Incarnation, 251, 275; reference to his criticism of Holsten on 1 Cor. xv. 45–47, 273; connection between Luke and Paul, 325, 326; Luke's 'universalism,' 328; on Mark xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13, 358; on Gal. i. 18, 372; on the truthfulness of the accounts of Paul's conversion, 377; on 2 Cor. xii. 1, 385; a bodily resurrection of Jesus, 386; reference to Renan's account of Paul's conversion, 389; on 1 Cor. xv. 8, 390; on the appearance of Jesus to Paul, and his apostleship, 392; on Rom. x. 6, 398; on Rom. ii. 16, 403; Rom. xi. 25 and Luke xxi. 24, 406; on Gal. i. 12, 423; on Rom. vii. and Paul's own experience, 430; Paul's theology rooted in the Old Testament, 432

Gore: the evidential value of the Pauline Epistles, p. 13; on Loman and Steck, 242; incidental nature of the references in the Epistles to the Gospels, 251;

on Paul's Christology, 254, 263 ; on the title Κύριος, 267 ; on the doctrine of a Suffering Messiah, 361 ; Resurrection of Jesus, as it took place, foreign to Jewish ideas, 366 ; criticism of the vision-theory, 395

Hagenbach: refers to Paret, p. 86 ; criticism of the demand for the absence of preconception, 304 ; the teaching of the various sects of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries with regard to the Incarnation and Resurrection, 388 ff.

Halcomb: his theory of the Gospels, p. 422 ; chapter on 'The Gospels in the Epistles,' 422

Harnack: on the personality of Jesus, p. 54 ; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 132 ; on Loman, 239 ; the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, 285 ; on the word ἐκκλησία, 309 ; on Baptism, 318 ; the Apostles and the death of Jesus, 349 ; the significance of His death, 354 ; on the words of Jesus at the Last Supper, 354 ; on the Resurrection of Jesus, 395 ; on the Ascension, 399 ; Paul's Hellenism, 432

Harris: the *Apology of Aristides* and the Incarnation, 278

Hase: on 1 Thessalonians, pp. 4 and 27 ; his *Leben Jesu*, 25 ; on Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 26 ff. ; on the value of the *Hauptbriefe*, 27 ; on Philippians and Colossians, 27 ; the title 'Son of Man,' 285 ; on the Apocryphal Gospels, 288 ; on the sinlessness of Jesus, 299 ; on the miraculous power of Jesus, 301 ; on Paul's visit to Peter, Gal. i. 18, 372 ; on the narratives of Paul's conversion, 391 ; the unsatisfactory nature of the vision-theory, 395 ; on the Resurrection of Jesus, *ibid.* ; on the Ascension of Jesus, 401

Hausrath: on the date of Paul's conversion, p. 3 ; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 51–54 ; on the silence of Josephus as to Jesus, 152 ; admission with regard to 2 Timothy, 178, 253 ; his Christology, 272 and 284 ; Jesus and the title of 'the Second Adam,' 282 ; on Jesus' life of poverty, 292 ; on His character, 294 ; His example of love known to Paul, 295 ; Paul's use of the term 'the Twelve,' 303 ; the teaching of Jesus in the Epistles, 311, 312 ; on Baptism, 317 ; on the distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and the command of Christ, 319 ; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321 ; on 1 Cor. x. 27, 322 ; further points in the teaching of Jesus and the Epistles, 325 ; on the agents in the death of Jesus, 350 ; a death in which He was nailed to a cross, 359 ; on Paul's conversion, 389 ; 1 Thess. v. and Matt. xxiv. 407 ; Paul and a written Gospel, 422 ; his picture of Paul's transformation into a Christian, 430 ; Paul's sense of sin, 431 ; Paul's Rabbinical training, 432 ; Paul's Hellenism, *ibid.*

Hettinger: on the mythical theory, p. 16 ; on the influence of Strauss upon Baur, 18 ; importance of *time* for the growth of the myth, 20 ; the fact of the burial of Jesus, 363 ; the Resurrection of Jesus, as it took place, foreign to Jewish ideas, 366

Hilgenfeld: accepts Rom. xv. 16, p. 5 ; accepts 1 Thessalonians and Philippians, 11 ; on Paul and the Twelve, 14 ; on Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 40 ff. ; endorses Gloël's criticism of Steck, 179, 239 ; on 4 Esdras, 212 ; emphatic protest against Steck and Völter, 239, 240 ; on Ephesians, 256 ; reference to his reply to the theories of Vischer and Völter, 259 ; on the date of the Hebrews, 356 ; the first appearances of the Risen Jesus, 368 ; on the meaning of ἱστορῆσαι in Gal. i. 18, 372

Holland, H. S.: contrast between our Lord's Resurrection and the myths surrounding great names, pp. 401, 402

Holsten: on 2 Cor. v. 16, p. 2; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 38, 39; on the relation between Paul and the Synoptists, 40; on the correct text and meaning of 1 Cor. i. 2, 137; opposes Steck's view of the dependence of Galatians upon Romans, 165; protest against the attack of Steck upon the *Hauptbriefe*, 239; his Christology, 272; the first appearances of the Risen Jesus, 368; his inference from 2 Cor. xii. 9 criticised by Beyschlag, 383; his view of Paul as a mere weak epileptic, 391; on Paul's retirement to Arabia, 424

Holtzmann, H. J.: his theory with regard to Colossians, pp. 9, 10; accepts Philippians, 11; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 66 ff.; importance attached to the 'words of the Lord,' 68; on 2 Cor. v. 16, 70; the history of the Passion, 70, 71; on Loman's position, 155; Justin Martyr and the fourth Gospel, 194; Luke's account of the Words of Institution, 200, 352; account of the Resurrection appearances in Luke and Paul, 201, 202, 370, 375; his acceptance of the *Hauptbriefe*, 243; the date of Ephesians, 256; reference to his review of Völter and Vischer on the Apocalypse, 259; connection between Mark and Paul, 310, 315; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's opinion and the command of the Lord, 319; on the sayings of Jesus, 324; Luke and Paul, 326, 327; no anti-Judaic tendency in Luke's Gospel, 329; his theory of the dependence of the fourth Gospel upon Paul, 340, 342; stress laid upon our Lord's last days, 350; the date of the Hebrews, 357; appearances of the Risen Jesus in Luke xxiv. and 1 Cor. xv., 375; Luke xxi. 24, Rom. xi. 25, 406; Jesus and prophecies of the Messiah, 416

Howson: reference to his evidential conclusions from the *Hauptbriefe*, p. 25; the character of Paul, 306; on 1 Cor. ii. 8, 350

Humphry: on John v. 18, p. 255; on Rom. iii. 25, 336; on 1 Tim. i. 15, 397; on the word παρουσία, 402; on Rom. viii. 22, 405; on Mnason (Acts xxi. 16), 426

Huraut: the union between Paul and the Twelve, p. 14; his treatise, 86; his debt to Paret, *ibid.*; on Gal. iv. 4, 252; Paul's knowledge of the miraculous birth of Jesus, 252; Paul's allusions to the human surroundings of Jesus, 293; Paul's knowledge of the character of Jesus, 295; the historical life of Jesus an example, 297; Paul's statement as to the sinlessness of Jesus, 298; derivation of Paul's miraculous powers from the historical Christ, 303; Gal. ii. 9 and Peter and John, *ibid.*; what is presupposed in the statement that Jesus was the Christ, 307; need of historical information for Paul's success in preaching, 307, 308; this, and the composition of the Pauline Churches, easily overlooked, 309; Paul's teaching and that of Jesus, 311, 312; probability that Baptism was instituted by Jesus, 317; on 1 Cor. ix. 10, and inference from it, 322, 323; on 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 325; on Rom. ii. 19, 325; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350; 1 Cor. v. 7 as a note of time, 351; 'the first day of the week,' 368; the Ascension, 398

Jowett: on 2 Cor. v. 16, p. 2; referred to by Paret, *ibid.*; on Rom. xvi. 13, 358

Keim: date of Paul's conversion, p. 3; on Paul's testimony, 4, 276; Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 44 ff.; Paul's character as a witness, 49; places a weapon in the hands of Apologists, 49, 50; on the attempt of Strauss to ignore the Pauline Epistles, 54, 132; refers to Paret, 86; on the traditional sayings of Jesus, 116, 122; his Christology, 255, 272, 275, 276; on the Incarnation, 274 ff.; the impression produced by the life of Jesus, 276;

the title 'Son of Man,' 286 ; the title not found in the Epistles, 287 ; on the sinlessness of Jesus, 299 ; the term 'the Twelve,' 303 ; the kingdom of God in the Epistles, 309 ; 1 Cor. viii. 12, 314 ; Baptism, 317 ; 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321 ; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350 ; the account of the Lord's Supper, 352–355 ; on Heb. v. 7, 357 ; on the degradation of the Cross, 360 ; the reality of the death of Jesus, 363, and of the burial of Jesus, 363, 364 ; Paul and the Resurrection of Jesus, 369, 370, 393; declines to accept the vision-theory, 393, 394 ; the Ascension and the New Testament writers, 397, 400; the *Acta Pilati* and the Ascension of Jesus, 400 ; stories of pagan heroes deified, 401 ; the *disastrous* death of Jesus, 401 ; claim of Jesus to be the future Judge, 403 ; the words of Jesus before the high priest, 413

Kellogg: on the Incarnation of Christ and the Christian Scriptures, p. 281

Kennedy: reference to his *Self-Revelation of Jesus Christ*, p. 25 ; Jewish monotheism, 272 ; the title 'Son of Man,' 282 ; significance of the figure of the bridegroom used by Jesus, 428

Kuenen: on Loman, p. 149

Lang, Andrew: on myths, p. 17

Leathes: his *Bampton Lectures*, p. 25 ; importance of the statement that Jesus was the Christ, 307

Lechler: agreement between Paul and the Twelve, pp. 14, 15 ; reference to connection between Acts xv. and Gal. ii., 158 and 232 ; on Gal. iv. 4, 245, 246, 251, 252 ; on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 250 ; on Rom. i. 3, 252 ; on Rom. viii. 3, 254 ; Paul's early Christology, 259; Christology of the Apocalypse, 259 ; on 1 Cor. viii. 6, 260 ; on the force of 1 Cor. i. 2 and Rom. x. 13, 264 ; on the personal pre-existence of Christ, 270, 271 ; on the force of the expression σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου in 2 Cor. xii. 12, 302 ; connection between John and Paul, 330 ; accounts of Paul's conversion, 377 ; Rom. ii. 16, 403

Lewin: on 1 Thess. v. and St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 406

Lichtenberger: his notice of Lechler, p. 245 ; on Baur's failure to account for the Resurrection of Jesus and the conversion of Paul, 396

Liddon: on Paul's Christology, p. 261 ; on the title 'Son of Man,' 282 ; on *religion*, 429

Lightfoot: Steck fails to take account of, p. 183 ; on Gal. i. 18, 229 ; no contradiction between Acts ix. 27 and Gal. i. 18, 19, 230 ; on Paul's visits to Jerusalem, 231 ; on Gal. iv. 4, 245, 247 ; on Col. i. 18, 259 ; on Phil. ii. 6, 261 ; on the word προεγράφη, Gal. iii. 1, 349; on ἀπό and παρά (1 Cor. xi. 23), 425

Lindemann: opposes Steck's view of Acts and Galatians, p. 158 ; Paul an historical character, 159, 160 ; the narratives of Paul's conversion, 162, 163 ; on the relation between Romans and Galatians, 164, 165 ; and between Romans and 1 Corinthians, 170, 171 ; on the position assigned by Steck to 2 Corinthians, 175 ; on Steck's alleged historical difficulties in Galatians, 177 ; on the style of Galatians, 178, 179 ; on Steck's criticism of 1 Cor. vii. 10, 191 ; against Steck's account of the Resurrection appearances, 208 ; historical accuracy of Gal. i. 18, 230 ; decided protest against Steck, 239 ; Paul's acquaintance with Christianity before his conversion, 418

Lipsius: accepts 1 Thessalonians, p. 4 ; on Rom. xv. xvi., 6 ; accepts Philippians, 11 ; on Gal. ii. 1, 163 ; Rom. ix.–xi. as against Völter, 224 ; on Gal. i. 18, 230 ; on Gal. ii. 1–10 as against Steck, 232 ; on the genuineness of Galatians, 237 ; on Steck and Völter, 239–242 ; on Rom. ix. 5, 281 ; on the kingdom of God

in the Pauline Epistles, 310; on Rom. xvi. 13, 358; on Paul's visit to Peter, Gal. i. 18, 372; on Rom. ii. 16, 402

Littledale: on 1 Cor. ii. 9, p. 116

Loman: his attack on the *Hauptbriefe*, p. 133; his theory examined, 144–149; replies of Kuenen and Scholten, 149–154; Harnack's criticism, 154; counter-reply of Loman, *ibid.*

Luthardt: reference to his reply to Strauss's criticism of the Last Supper, p. 355; on Paul's conversion, 392

Maclear: the phrase 'lived amongst men' and the Nicene Creed, p. 291; the evidential value of the Eucharist, 355, 356; on 'the first day of the week,' 368, 369; on 1 Cor. xv. 5, 370; significance of the figure of the bridegroom used by Jesus, 428

Mangold: on Paul's acquaintance with Jesus, p. 2; accepts 1 Thessalonians, 4; on Rom. xv. xvi., 6; refers to Paret, 86; on Ephesians, 256; Paul and Luke, 326; on Hebrews, 357; on 1 Cor. xv. 6, 376, 382, 384; Paul and the Spirit of Christ, 403, 427; Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 422

Marshall: on 'the Aramaic Gospel,' p. 106; Luke xxi. 35 and 1 Thess. v. 3, with reference to his question, 'Did Paul use a Semitic Gospel?' 405, 421: reference to his theory of an *Urevangelium*, 426

Martineau: accepts six of the Pauline Epistles, p. 11; on Gal. iv. 4 and the pre-existence of Christ, 249; on 1 Cor. x. 4 and 2 Cor. viii. 9, 249 and 270; on 1 Cor. viii. 6, 260 and 272; his theory of the application of the titles Lord, Judge, Saviour to Jesus, 267, 268; his denial that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, 285

Massie: on Paul's conversion, pp. 379, 391

Matheson: his *Historical Christ of St. Paul*, p. 25; on Gal. iv. 4, 245, 246; on 2 Cor. xiii. 14, 262; on the sinlessness of Jesus, 298; on Gal. ii. 9, 303; on 1 Cor. vi. 2, 311; on 1 Cor. viii. 12, 314; on Baptism, 317; on the distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and a command of Jesus, 319; St. Paul and St. John, 329, 330; on the significance of the Lord's Supper, 356; on 2 Cor. xii. 9 and the Agony, *ibid.*; on the doctrine of a Crucified Messiah, 361, 362; on Paul's visit to Peter, Gal. i. 18, 372; on the appearances of the Risen Jesus, 373, 374; on the word ἔκτρωμα, 381

McRealsham: reference to his criticism of Steck and Völter, p. 133

Meyer (Commentary): refers to Paret, p. 86; on 1 Cor. ii. 9, 116; on 1 Cor. ix. 10, 119; on 1 Cor. xi. 26, 121; on 1 Cor. x. 4, 270; on 2 Cor. xi. 15, 297; on James ii. 19 (Beyschlag in 5th edit.), 302; on 1 Pet. v. 17 (Kühl in 5th edit.), 313; on Paul's conception of righteousness (Kühl on 1 Peter, 5th edit.), *ibid.*; on 1 Cor. v. 7, 351; on the appearances of the Risen Jesus, 373, 374, 387; on 1 Thess. v. and Matt. xxiv. 406; on ἀπό in 1 Cor. xi. 23, 424

Mill, W. H.: on the mythical theory, p. 16; on 2 Tim. ii. 8, 253; on the Incarnation, 289; comparison of his arguments with those of B. Weiss, 289

Milligan: on John xi. 24, p. 366; on the expression 'the first day of the week,' 368, 369; reference to his discussion of the word ὤφθη, 370, 386; our Lord's Ascension, 397, 398, 399; significance of the belief in the return of Jesus, 414

Murphy: reference to points of connection between St. Paul and St. John, p. 330

Neander: on 2 Cor. v. 16, p. 2; on Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus, 36 ff.; on Paul's acquaintance with the miraculous conception of Jesus, 252;

significance of Paul's acknowledgment of Christ's descent from David, 253; the Incarnation cannot be derived from Jewish sources, 277; or from Pagan sources, 278; the title 'Son of Man,' 286; the teaching of Jesus in the Epistles and Gospels, 311, 324, 328; the Baptismal formula, 318; on 1 Cor. xv. 7, 373; the Ascension of Jesus, 399; Paul and written memoirs of Jesus, 422; his retirement to Arabia, 424; choice of Saul the Pharisee to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, 434

Nicholson: on the traditionary sayings of Jesus, pp. 115, 120, 129, 131; on 1 Cor. xv. 7, 373; on 1 Cor. xv. 8, 374

Nösgen: on the mythical theory, p. 17; time essential for the growth of the myth, 19; reference to his criticism of Beyschlag on the Incarnation, 100, 290; on the extra canonical sayings of Jesus, 105, 131; on Acts ix. 27 and Gal. i. 18, 230; opposes Steck's theory, 242; on the Incarnation, 275, 277, 278; the contents of Paul's preaching, 308; on Baptism, 317; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321; Paul's acquaintance with the teaching of Jesus, 347; the reality of the death of Jesus, 363; His burial, *ibid.*; 'the first day of the week,' 368, 369; the appearance to the five hundred, 376; the appearance to Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 8, 385; the Ascension of Jesus, 397

Paret: on Paul's acquaintance with Jesus, p. 2; Paul's Christology, 15; the Tübingen School and Paul, 27; on Baur, 28, 29; his writings, 85; recognition by various theologians, 86; on Rom. vi. 3, 115; on 1 Cor. ix. 10, 118; reference to by Resch, *ibid.*; agreement between Paul and the Twelve, 158; the title 'Son of Man,' 282; 'the Second Adam' and 'the Son of Man,' 282, 284; the human surroundings of Jesus, 293; His character and ministry, 294; His example, 295; His sinlessness, 298; the historical terms in Paul's Epistles, 302; Paul and the miracles of Jesus, 302–304; no miracles ascribed to the Baptist, 305; Paul's preaching of Jesus as the Christ, 307; its significance, 307–309; the teaching of Jesus in the Epistles, 311–315; significance of Paul's account of the Lord's Supper, 315, 316; on Baptism, 316, 317; the distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and a command of Jesus, 319, 320; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 320–322; on 1 Cor. x. 27, 322; on 1 Cor. ix. 10, 323; Paul and John, 329; on the word προεγράφη, Gal. iii. 1, 349; Paul's knowledge of the betrayal and crucifixion of Jesus, 350–353, 359, 362; the burial of Jesus, 363; 'according to the Scriptures,' 1 Cor. xv. 3, 367; 'the first day of the week,' 368; the appearances enumerated by Paul, 369, 373; agreement with the Twelve, 377; the narratives of Paul's conversion, *ibid.*; full account of his examination of Paul's testimony to the appearance of the Risen Jesus, 378–387; on the Ascension of Jesus, 398; on 1 Thess. v. and Matt. xxiv., 404–408; his view of 1 Thess. iv. 15, 409, 410; Paul and the Old Testament, 416, 417, 418; on Paul's acquaintance with the teaching of Jesus *before* his conversion, 418; and *after* his conversion, 419, 420; contrast between Paul's teaching as a Christian and Rabbinical methods, 420; Paul and the older Apostles, their gradual training, 423; on the significance of Paul's words upon the Lord's Supper, 425; sources of Paul's information, 426; Paul's treatment of historical facts, 427; Paul's mystical use of the preposition ἐν, as in St. John, 428; his spiritual union with Christ, 429

Pierson and Naber: referred to by Holtzmann, p. 134; their theory as to Paul and his Epistles, 139–144; reference to by Steck and van Manen, 144; by Völter, 216

Pfleiderer: accepts 1 Thessalonians, p. 4; admissions with regard to Colossians, 10; accepts Philippians, 11; on Ullmann, 21; on Edersheim, 22; criticism of Schwegler, 29; on Holsten, 40; on Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 64 ff.; narratives of the Gospels the elaboration of statements in the Epistles, 87; application of this theory, 87–91; criticism, 89–93, 245; on Harnack, 132; admissions with regard to 2 Timothy, 178; on Christ's pre-existence, Gal. iv. 4, 249; on this pre-existence as *personal*, *ibid.*; on Rom. ix. 5, 262; the word Κύριος as applied to Christ, 266; on 1 Cor. x. 4, 270; on Phil. ii. 6, 271; Christ as 'the archetypal man,' 272; Paul and the earthly life of Jesus, 292, 293; Mark and Paul, 310, 314, 315; on the appearance of the Risen Jesus to the five hundred, 373; on Paul at his conversion, 390; on Rom. vii., 430; significance which he attaches to the death of Jesus, 431; Paul and Philo, 432, 433; the 'mystical' element in Paul, 433; transforming power of the religion of Jesus, 433

Plumptre: reference to his treatment of the connection between Paul and the historical Jesus, p. 25; on Gal. iv. 4, 245; on the word Κύριος in Luke's Gospel, 267; Jewish ideas and the Incarnation, 279; on Matt. xx. 28, 283; the title 'Son of Man,' its omission in the Epistles, 287; on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 291; on 2 Cor. x. 1, 294; no miracle ascribed to the Baptist, 305; the teaching of Jesus in the Epistles, 312, 313; on Acts xx. 28, 315; Paul and the acts and words of Jesus, 348; the force of Gal. iii. 1, 349; the evidential value of the Eucharist, 356; Mark xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13, 358

Pressensé: on Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus, pp. 73 ff.; criticism of Keim and Sabatier on the Incarnation, 251; on 2 Tim. ii. 8, 253; on the lineage of the Virgin and Joseph, 289

Renan: Paul as a contemporary of Jesus, pp. 2, 3; his classification of the Pauline Epistles, 9, 10; on Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 71 ff.; on the narratives of the Passion, 72; on the first two chapters of St. Luke, 92; reference to his remarks on 1 Cor. xi. 26, 121; on Paul's Christology, 258; on the Baptist, 305; on Paul and Luke, and the Last Supper, 352, 353; date of Hebrews, 356; on miracles, 382 *note*; on Paul's conversion, 389, 395; on 1 and 2 Thessalonians and the day of the Lord, 404, 406

Resch: refers to Paret, pp. 86, 118; importance of his *Agrapha*, 105; P. Ewald's criticism, 106 ff.; examination of the *Logia* quoted by Resch, 114 ff.; Bousset's criticism, 129, 131; reference to his account of the Words of Institution, 353; his theory of an *Urevangelium*, 426

Reuss: on Rom. xvi., p. 6; on the Pauline Epistles, 7, 8; the sayings of Jesus and oral tradition, 131; St. Paul's knowledge of the life of Jesus, 131; on the Gospel of St. Luke and 2 Cor. viii. 18 and 2 Tim. ii. 8, 193; reference to his defence of 2 Timothy, 253; on Phil. ii. 6, 7, 255; on the Christology of Ephesians and Colossians, 257–261; Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels, 288; on Paul's Apostleship, 393; on Paul's conversion, 395; Paul's early Christology, 400; on 1 Thess. v., 406; Paul and the Old Testament, 417; the mystical element in Paul's teaching, 428

Ritschl: no fundamental opposition between Paul and the Twelve, p. 14; criticism of Schwegler, 33; Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus, 33; on Rom. ix. 5 and Titus ii. 13, 262; on the force of Κύριος as applied to Jesus, 262; the title 'Son of Man,' 285

Roos: on 1 Thessalonians, p. 11; on the Pastoral Epistles, 253; on Paul's Christology, 255; the character of Jesus, 295; on the kingdom of God, 310, 313; on the Lord's Prayer, 313; the teaching of Jesus, 323; on the Johannine tradition, 330; criticism by P. Ewald, *ibid.*; on 2 Cor. xii. 8, 356; on the list of Resurrection appearances, 376; Paul and the older disciples, 423

Row: works bearing on the subject of these pages, p. 25; on the miraculous birth and circumcision of Jesus, 245; the Pauline Epistles and the Book of Enoch, 259; the character of Jesus in the Epistles, 295; Paul and the miracles of Jesus, 301, 306; on 1 Cor. viii. 12 and Matt. xxv. 40, 314; St. Paul and St. John, 330; on the force of Gal. iii. 1, 349; on 1 Tim. vi. 13 and John xviii. 36, 351; significance of the belief in our Lord's return, 414

Sabatier: on Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, p. 2; on Rom. xv. xvi., 5; the connection between Colossians, Ephesians, and Philippians, 8, 9; agreement between Paul and the Twelve, 14; on the Tübingen school, 28; reference to Paret, 86; Baur's *Nebenfragen*, 244; on the Incarnation, 250, 251; the force of ἴδιος in Rom. viii. 32, 254; Christology of Colossians and Ephesians, 257; Baur's explanation of Phil. ii. 6, 7, 261; the significance of the word Κύριος, 266; on the pre-existence of Christ, 269; Paul's Christology, 281; 'the Second Adam' and 'the Son of Man,' 283; the human surroundings of Jesus, 293; the ministry of Jesus, 294; the example of Jesus, 297; on the Temptation, *ibid.*; the term 'the Twelve,' 303; the teaching of Jesus, 312; Paul's words of comfort to the Thessalonians, 318; the distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and a command of Jesus, 319; further examples of the teaching of Jesus, 323; the force of Gal. iii. 1, 349; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350; 1 Cor. v. 7 a note of time, 351; the nailing of Jesus to the Cross, 359; the revilings of the Crucified, *ibid.*; the death of Jesus, 362; the burial of Jesus, 363; 'the first day of the week,' 368; the word ἱστορῆσαι, Gal. i. 18, 372; the narratives of Paul's conversion, 377; agreement with Paret on Paul's own statements with regard to his conversion, 379; similar agreement with regard to 2 Cor. xii. 9, 385; on the bodily resurrection of Jesus, 386; Sabatier's present views, 388 *note*; Paul's mental state at his conversion, 390, 391; eschatology of the Gospels and Epistles, 404, 405; change in Paul's eschatology, 412; the use of Jewish Apocalyptic terms by Jesus, 413; Paul's acquaintance with the human life of Jesus, 415, 419; Paul and the Old Testament, 417; Paul and Rabbinism, 420; the sources of Paul's knowledge, 422, 423; the spiritual side of Paul's nature, 427; the spiritual element in Jesus, 428; a mystical union with Jesus in St. Paul and St. John alike, 428, 429; Paul and the power of the Cross, 434, 435

Sadler: *The Lost Gospel* and the expression 'contemporary history,' p. 4

Salmon: on Holtzmann's theory on Colossians, p. 9; evidential value of Paul's Epistles, 13; refers to Resch, 106; Hermas and Ephes. iv. 30, 126; on the traditional saying 'show yourselves approved money-changers,' 129; on patristic quotations, 131; reference to Gloël, 161; version of the Words of Institution, 199, 353; Paul and John, 260, 330; on 2 Timothy, 253; date of the Apocalypse, 259; reference to Acts xx. 28, 315; on 1 Cor. x. 27 and Luke x. 8, 322, 327; Holtzmann and Luke's dependence upon the Pauline Epistles, 327; reference to his criticism of Strauss's account of the Last Supper, 355; date of the Hebrews, 357; the eschatology of the Epistles and the Gospels, 406, 408

Sanday: reference to his remarks on the evidential value of Paul's Epistles, p. 13; reference to Resch, 105; on the *Agrapha*, 105, 118, 119, 128, 129; his strictures upon, 131; on Peter's conduct, Gal. ii., 160; on Gloël, 161

Schanz: time in growth of myths, p. 20; on Rom. ix. 5, 262; the force of Κύριος, 266; on 1 Cor. x. 4, 270; 'the heavenly man,' 1 Cor. xv., 272; the Incarnation, 281; 'the Son of Man,' 285, 286; the death of Jesus, 363; on Paul's list of appearances of the Risen Jesus, 376

Schenkel: accepts 1 and 2 Thessalonians, p. 10; defence of Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, *ibid.*; on Paul's acquaintance with the life of Jesus, 43, 44; on Col. ii. 11, 245; his Christology, 260, 261, 270; on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 292; on the sinlessness of Jesus, 299; on the burial of Jesus, 363; reference to Milligan's reply to his strictures on the Ascension, 399; Paul and Philo, 432

Schleiermacher: his denial of the Ascension, p. 397

Schmid: testimony to the evidential value of Paul's Epistles, p. 13; the teaching of Paul and Luke, 251; descent of Jesus from David in the New Testament, 253; Paul's monotheism, 255, 276; on 1 Cor. viii. 6, 260, 272; on 1 Cor. xv. 47, 269; the personal pre-existence of Christ, 271; on Isaiah vii. 14, 277; future participation of Gentiles in salvation, 294; the sinlessness of Jesus, 298, 299; continuance of miraculous power in early Church, 301, 306; Paul's teaching on righteousness, derived from Jesus, 312; Paul's distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between his own opinion and a command of Jesus, 319; reference of the words of Jesus at the Last Supper, 356; the narratives of Paul's conversion, 377; the Ascension of Jesus, 397; Jewish ideas of the Messiah and the Ascension of Jesus, 400

Schmiedel: on 2 Cor. v. 16, p. 2; accepts 1 Thessalonians, 4; on 1 Cor. xi. 26, 121; criticism of Steck, 207, 240; on harmonising appearances of the Risen Jesus, 375; on the Resurrection appearances, 386; on 1 Thess. iv. 15, 408; on the distinction between ἀπό and παρά (1 Cor. xi. 23), 425

Scholten: dissent from, and reply to, Loman, pp. 151 ff.

Schürer: on Keim's chronology, p. 3; 'the Suffering Messiah,' 23; reference to his remarks on Luke ii. 42, 246; on 1 Cor. vi. 2, 311; 1 Cor. ix. 14 and Matt. x. 10, Luke x. 7, 320

Schwegler: his position criticised by Pfleiderer, p. 29; on Jewish and Pauline Christianity, *ibid.*; Paul's relation to the historical Christ, 32; to Christ's teaching, *ibid.*; on Jesus as the Christ, 32, 347; on the personality of Jesus, 33; on the death of Jesus, 34, 361

Stanley: 'the Christ' of the Epistles and of the Gospels, p. 24; on the phrase *lived amongst men*, 291; on 2 Cor. viii. 9, 292; the miracles of Jesus and the Epistles, 301; on Acts xx. 28, 315; Paul and Luke's Gospel, 326; 1 Tim. vi. 13 and John xviii. 36, 351; on the appearance to the five hundred, 374; Paul as an 'Evangelist,' 415

Stanton: the evidential value of the Pauline Epistles, pp. 13, 15, 25; the title 'Son of Man' and the Epistles, 287; no miracles ascribed to the Baptist, 305; on the Church (Matt. xvi. 18, 19), 309; the doctrine of a 'Suffering Messiah,' 361; Old Testament prophecy and the Resurrection of Jesus, 365; significance of the claim of Jesus to be the future Judge, 403

Steck: repeats the argument of Bruno Bauer, p. 133; condemns his tone and recklessness, 140; attack upon the *Hauptbriefe*, 156; alleged discrepancies between Acts and Galatians, 156–163; alleged dependence of Galatians upon Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, 164–176; method of dealing with the external

evidence in support of the *Hauptbriefe*, 176–188 ; alleged instances of dependence of the *Hauptbriefe* upon the Gospels, 189–193 ; Pauline Epistles and the Gospel of St. Luke, 193–196 ; on the account of the Lord's Supper, 197–200, 352 ; on the Resurrection appearances in 1 Cor. xv., 200–207, 373 ; Paul's Christology, 207–211 ; the *Hauptbriefe* and extra-canonical writings, 211–213 ; Philo and Seneca, 213–216 ; criticism of his position by Hilgenfeld, Godet, &c., 239-241 ; on Gal. iv. 4, 247 ; Phil. ii. 5, 270 ; 1 Cor. x. 4, 270 ; refers Rom. ix. 5 to Christ, 281 ; on Gal. i. 17, 380

Steinhart : on the story of Plato's miraculous birth, pp. 279, 280

Steinmeyer : significance of Gal. iv. 4, 5, p. 245 ; on Isaiah vii. 14, 277 ; Strauss and the Incarnation, 280 ; Strauss and Heb. v. 7, 357 ; Heb. xiii. 12, 13, 357 ; Old Testament prophecy and the Resurrection of Jesus, 365 ; Jewish ideas and the Resurrection of Jesus, 366 ; the death of Jesus, 367 ; on 1 Cor. xv. 5, 370 ; on 1 Cor. xv. 7, 373 ; reference to his remarks on the word ἔκτρωμα, 381 ; criticism of Strauss on Paul's conversion, 390 ; Paul's conversion and his Apostleship, 392 ; the Ascension of Jesus, 397, 399, 400 ; the Old Testament and the Ascension, 400 ; truthfulness of the Ascension, 401

Strack and Zöckler (Commentary) : on Gal. iv. 4, p. 245 ; on Col. ii. 11, *ibid.* ; on Heb. v. 7, 357 ; on 1 Cor. xv. 5, 373, 374 ; on 1 Cor. xv. 6, 374 ; on ἔκτρωμα, 381 ; 1 Thess. iv. 15 and the *Didaché*, 407 ; sources of Paul's information, 426

Strauss : the mythical theory, pp. 16, 17 ; influenced by Baur, 18 ; ignores the value of Paul's testimony, 19, 20 ; weakness of the mythical theory, 16, 20–23 ; attaches no importance to the likelihood of Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 29 ; attempt to explain the Incarnation from heathen sources, 280 ; his demand for absence of preconception, 304 ; Jesus and the Last Supper, 354, 355 ; on Heb. v. 7, 357 ; on the reality of the death of Jesus, 362, 363 ; on the burial of Jesus, 363 ; the Resurrection and Jewish ideas, 366 ; on the appearances of the Risen Jesus, 367 ; his account of Paul's conversion, 390 ; the Ascension of Jesus, 397, 399 ; claim of Jesus to be the future Judge, 403 ; on Paul's knowledge of Christian belief, 418

Thenius : his letter to Bruno Bauer, p. 86 ; recent references to it, *ibid.* ; anticipates Pfleiderer's theory, 87 ; the aim of the Epistles, 291 ; Paul's knowledge of the human surroundings of Jesus, 293 ; the example of Jesus known to Paul, 296, 297 ; triumph of Jesus over the power of the senses, and Paul's testimony to his sinlessness, 298, 299 ; the teaching of Jesus, 311 ff. ; on Baptism, 317 ; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and the command of Jesus, 319, 320 ; on 1 Cor. xiii. 2, 325 ; Luke and Paul, 326 ; John and Paul, 330 ; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350 ; on 1 Tim. vi. 13 and John xviii. 36, 351 ; on 1 Cor. v. 7 as a note of time, 351 ; 'the first day of the week,' 368 ; the bodily Resurrection of Jesus, 386

Uhlhorn : Paul's character and his miracles, 306 ; critical discernment of the early Church, *ibid.* ; Baptism, 317 ; Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 347 ; the fact of the burial of Jesus, 363

Ullmann : on myths, p. 16 ; the Pauline Epistles and the mythical theory, 19 ; Strauss and the Gospels, 20 ; in relation to Strauss, 21, 132 ; on the Apocryphal Gospels, 287 ; the sinlessness of Jesus, 298–300 ; the miraculous power of Jesus, 301, 305 ; no miracle ascribed to the Baptist, 305 ; the significance of the Crucifixion of Jesus, 360 ; the Old Testament and the Resurrection of Jesus, 365

Van Manen : his article against Pierson and Naber, and his own subsequent

position, p. 144 ; summary of Loman's view, 148 ; his judgment on Loman 149 ; account of Loman's opponents, 150 ff. ; on the historical Paul, 160

Vischer: and the *Apocalypse*, p. 259

Volkmar: on Paul's conversion, p. 3 ; date to which he assigns the Gospels, 12, 88, 90 ; on Luke's narrative of the Incarnation and the Pauline Epistles, 88 ff. ; on the narrative in Matt. ii., 89 ; criticism of his position, 92, 93, 245 ; adverse to Steck, 239 ; the kingdom in the Gospels and Epistles, 310–314 ; Mark and Paul, 314 ; the word εὐαγγέλιον, 321 ; date of the Hebrews, 357

Völter: reproduces the arguments of Bruno Bauer, p. 133 ; attack on the *Hauptbriefe* similar in many respects to that of Steck, 189, 216 ; examination of his theories with regard to the Romans, 216–224 ; with regard to the Galatians, 225–239 ; his disintegration of the *Apocalypse*, 259 ; Mark xv. 21 and Rom. xvi. 13, 358 ; on Gal. i. 17, 380

Von Soden: accepts 1 Thessalonians, p. 4 ; defends Colossians, 8 ; on the Ephesians, 256 ; on 1 Cor. x. 4, 270 ; on the Hebrews, 357 ; the Hebrews and the life of Jesus, 357

Wace: on significance of 2 Cor. xiii. 14, p. 262 ; the Epistles and the Nicene Creed, 263

Watkins: on Evanson's attack upon the Romans, 134 ; the date of classical MSS., 134 ; on Ritschl, 138

Weiss, B.: on Paul's acquaintance with Jesus, p. 2 ; on Rom. xv. xvi., 6 ; on the Pauline Epistles, 12 ; the mythical theory, 17, 20, 21 ; on Paul's acquaintance with the details of the earthly life of Jesus, 77–84 ; refers to Paret's treatises, 86 ; on the words of the Lord, 115, 116 ; 1 Cor. ix. 10, 119 ; on the *Logia*, 119, 129 ; on the acquaintance of Hermas with James and Ephesians, 126 ; forgeries and the early Church, 144 ; on Steck and the Acts, 157 ; Steck's doubts upon Paul's long absence from Jerusalem after his conversion, 162 ; on Marcion, 187 ; St. John's Gospel and Justin Martyr, 194 ; on the supposed 'tendency' of the Acts, and the discrepancies alleged by Völter and others between Galatians and Acts, 230, 231 ; Steck's attack upon the *Hauptbriefe*, 239, 242 ; on Gal. iv. 4, 245 ; Paul and the miraculous conception of Jesus, 250, 257 ; stress laid by Paul upon Christ's descent from David, 253 ; Colossians and Ephesians, 256 ; the Christology of the *Apocalypse*, 259 ; on Col. i. 18, *ibid.* ; 1 Cor. viii. 6 as against Baur and Schenkel, 260, 272 ; Rom. ix. 5, 262, 281 ; the force of the title Κύριος, 265, 266 ; 1 Cor. xv. 47, 268, 269 ; Christ's pre-existence no merely ideal, 270, 271 ; Paul and Philo, 273 ; the Ebionites and the Incarnation, 277, 290 ; on the Jewish interpretation of Isaiah vii. 14, 277 ; the Incarnation not derived from pagan sources, 278 ; Jewish views of marriage and the Incarnation, 279 ; Canonical and Apocryphal Gospels, 288 ; comparison between his arguments and those of W. H. Mill, 289 ; criticised by Beyschlag, 289, 290 ; Paul's references to the sufferings of Jesus, 296 ; to the sinlessness of Jesus, 298 ; the New Testament and the sinlessness of Jesus, 300 ; on Gal. v. 14 and Rom. xiii. 8, and the commands of Jesus, 314 ; on Matt. xxviii. 19, 318 ; Paul's express reference to the words of Jesus in 1 Cor. vii. 10 and ix. 14, 318, 319 ; Luke and Paul, 327 ; Luke's 'universalism,' 328 ; on the supposed anti-Judaic 'tendency' of Luke's Gospel, 329 ; on Johannine ideas and words in the *Didaché*, 332 ; on Gal. iii. 1, 349 ; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350 ; on 1 Cor. xi. 23, 351 ; on 1 Cor. v. 7 as a note of time, *ibid.* ; on the accounts of the Lord's Supper, 352, 356 ; date of the Hebrews, 357 ; on Heb. v. 7, *ibid.* ;

on Rom. xv. 3, 359 ; the burial of Jesus, 363 ; Old Testament prophecy and the Resurrection of Jesus, 365 ; the Resurrection, as it took place, contrary to Jewish ideas, 366–368 ; the appearances of the Risen Jesus in 1 Cor. xv., 373, 374, 394 ; on 2 Cor. xii. 9, in agreement with Paret, 385 ; significance of 1 Cor. xv. 8, *ibid.* ; Paul's mental state at his conversion, 390, 391 ; the Resurrection of Jesus, 395 ; connection between the Resurrection and the Ascension, 397 ; the infamy of the death of the Cross, 401 ; on 1 Thess. v. 2, 404 ; on Matt. xxiv., 409 ; Paul's preaching as 'the Apostle of the Gentiles,' 419 ; the sayings and discourses of Jesus, and their historical framework, 421 ; on Gal. i. 12 and 17, 423, 424

Weizsäcker: on 2 Cor. v. 16, pp. 2, 3, 62 ff. ; on Rom. xv. xvi., 5, 6 ; accepts 1 Thessalonians and Philippians, 11 ; Paul's respect for the older Apostles, 14 ; the Cross a stumbling-block in the second century, 23 ; on Paul's acquaintance with the historical Jesus, 62, 63 ; importance attached to the words of Jesus, 63, 64 ; refers to Paret's treatise, 85 ; on 1 and 2 Corinthians, 243 ; on the personal pre-existence of Christ, 249 ; on 1 Cor. x. 4, 270 ; on διακονεῖν in Paul and the Gospels, 283 ; the intrepid calmness of Paul, 306 ; Paul's use of the term 'the Church of God,' 310 ; Matt. v. 39 and 1 Cor. vi. 7, 311 ; the word *Abba* in Gal. iv. 6 and Rom. viii. 15, 313 ; on the law of Christ in Gospels and Epistles, 314 ; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and the command of Jesus, 319 ; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321 ; the Words of Institution, 353 ; on the Baptist, 366 ; the appearances of the Risen Jesus in Galilee, 367, 370 ; criticism of his theory with regard to the part played by Peter in the belief in the Resurrection, 370–372 ; Paul and his Apostleship, 393 ; claim of Jesus to be the future Judge, 403 ; Jesus and the prophecies of the Messiah, 416 ; Paul's Rabbinical knowledge, 420 ; 1 Cor. vii. 17, 425

Wendt: the doctrine of a 'Suffering Messiah,' pp. 23 and 361 ; on the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles, 61 ; on Paul's acquaintance with the life and sayings of Jesus, 100 ff. ; on the traditionary sayings of Jesus, 104 ; reference to Paul's testimony to the Davidic descent of Jesus, 294 ; the kingdom of God in the Epistles and Gospels, 309, 310 ; on the word *Abba*, Gal. iv. 6, Rom. viii. 15, 313 ; on Acts xx. 28, 315 ; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's opinion and a command of Jesus, 319 ; Luke and Paul, and the teaching of Jesus, 328 ; reference to the Words of Institution, 352 ; on the significance of the Lord's Supper, 356 ; reference to his view of 1 Thess. iv. 15, 408

Westcott: reference to his *Study of the Gospels*, p. 25 ; on our Lord's traditional sayings, 116, 117, 118, 120, 123, 125, 127 ; on Col. ii. 11, 245 ; force of the word Κύριος, 267 ; on 1 Thess. i. 6, 296 ; the Epistles and the miracles of Jesus, 301 ; no miracle attributed to the Baptist, 305 ; the connection between the Epistles and the Gospels, 347 ; on the force of προεγράφη in Gal. iii. 1, 349 ; on 1 Tim. vi. 13 and St. John xviii. 36, 351 ; on 1 Cor. v. 7, *ibid.* ; date of the Hebrews, 357 ; the Hebrews and the life of Jesus, *ibid.* ; the doctrine of a 'Suffering Messiah,' 361 ; the significance of the New Testament accounts of the Resurrection of Jesus, 367, 394 ; significance of the belief in the return of Jesus, 414 ; on ἀπό in 1 Cor. xi. 23, 425

Wilson: on the derivation of Paul's miraculous power from Christ, p. 306

Wittichen: date of Paul's conversion, p. 3 ; accepts 1 Thessalonians and the *Hauptbriefe*, 4, 62 ; on Paul's knowledge of the historical Jesus, 54 ff. ; on

Rom. i. 3, 57, 252 ; on Gal. iv. 4, 245 ; the ministry of Jesus, 294 ; Jesus as an example, 296 ; the impression made by Jesus, 301 ; distinction in 1 Cor. vii. between Paul's own opinion and a command of Jesus, 319 ; on 1 Cor. ix. 14, 321 ; the Epistles and the teaching of Jesus, 323 ; the agents in the death of Jesus, 350

Wordsworth : on Luke's Gospel and 1 Thessalonians, p. 406

Wright : importance attached to the Catechists in the early Church, p. 35

Wynne : reference to his *Fragmentary Records*, &c., p. 25

Zahn : criticism of the Pauline Epistles, p. 134 ; Baur's position, 134–138 ; on Weisse and Hitzig, 138 ; on Pierson and Naber, 139-144 ; criticism of Steck, 156 ; insufficient list of Steck's authorities, 183 ; criticism of Steck's view of Marcion's testimony, 187 ; and of Polycarp's testimony, 188

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

Date Due

F 21 '30

Overdue

NOV 28 '66

BS2650.4 .K73
The witness of the epistles : a study in
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00074 5622